HINDUTVA

BY

A MARATHA

RE. 1

MAY 1923

HINDUTVA

Presented by S. Murugappa
23-10-58.

BY

A MARATHA

आसिंधु सिंधुपर्यंता यस्य भारतभूमिका
पितृभूः पुण्यभूश्चैव स वै हिंदुरिति स्मृतः॥
Essentials of Hindutva; Page 103

MAY 1923

Publisher—V. V. KELKAR, B.A., LL,B., ***Nagpur,***

Printer—K. R. Gondhalekar, Jagadhitechu Press,
507, ***Shanwar, Poona City.***

PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

WE consider ourselves fortunate in being able to present this publication to the reading-world. We are sure that the forcible style, the convincing arguments, the passionate pieading, and the able survey will attract the attention of even those that hold different views from the author of this work, and will pause to reconsider their decisions after its perusal.

Nothing is needed to introduce the reader to the subject as the author himself will do it, so beautifully that, we do not want to stand between the reader and the author any longer by thrusting an introduction where none is required. We have just taken the reader to the gate from where no formal permission or introdution is required. He has merely to turn over this and at once be conversant with the author himself.

PUBLISHER.

Essentials of Hindutva.

I

We hope that the fair Maid of Verona who made the impassioned appeal to her lover to change " A name " that was " nor hand, nor foot, nor arm, nor face, nor any other part belonging to a man " would forgive us for this our idolatrous attachment to it when we make bold to assert that, ' Hindus we are and love to remain so !" We too would, had we been in the position of that good Friar, have advised her youthful lover to yield to the pleasing pressure of the logic which so fondly urged " What's in a name ? That which we call a rose would smell as sweet by any other name!" For, things do matter more than their names, especially when you have to choose one only of the two, or when the association between them is either new or simple; The very fact that a thing is indicated by a dozen names in a dozen human tongues disarms the suspicion that there is an invariable connection or natural concomitance between sound and the meaning it conveys. Yet, as the association of the word with the thing it signifies grows stronger and lasts long, so does the

channel which connects the two states of consciousness tend to allow an easy flow of thought from one to another, till at last it seems almost impossible to separate them. And when in addition to this, a number of secondery thoughts or feelings that are generally roused by the thing get mystically entwined with the word that signifies it, the name seems to matter as much as the thing itself. Would the fair Apostle of the creed that so movingly questioned "What's in a name?" have liked it herself to nickname the God of her idolatry as "Paris" instead of "Romeo"? or would *he* have been ready to swear by the moon that tipped with silver all the fruit tree tops, that it would serve as sweet and musical to his heart to call his "Juliet" by 'any other name' such as for example—"Rosaline"? Nay more; there are words which simply an idea in itself extremely complex or an ideal or a vast and abstract generalization which seem to take, as it were, a being unto themselves or live and grow as an organism would do. Such names though they be" 'nor hand, nor foot, nor any other part belonging to a man,' are not all that, precisely because they are the very soul of man. They become the idea itself and live longer than generations of men do. Jesus died but Christ has servived the 'Roman' Emperors and that Empire. Inscribe at the foot of one of those beautiful paintings of 'Madona' the name of 'Fatima' and a Spaniard would keep gazing at it as curiously as at any other piece of art; but just restore the name of 'Madona' instead, and behold his knees would loose their stiffness and bend, his eyes their inquisitiveness and turn inwards in adoring

recognition, and his whole being get suffused with a consciousness of the presence of Divine Motherhood and Love! What is in a name? Ah! call Ayodhya—Honololu, or nickname her immortal Prince—a Pooh bal, or ask the Americans to change Washington into a Chengizkhan, or persuade a Mohomedan to call himself a jew, and you would soon find that the "open sesame" was not the only word of its type!

To this category of names which have been to mankind subtle source of life and inspiration belongs the word Hindutva, the essential nature and significance of which we mean to investigate into. The ideas and ideals, the systems and societies, the thoughts and sentiments which have centered round this name are so varied and rich, so powerful and so subtle, so elusive and yet so vivid, that the term Hindutva defies all attempts at analysis. Forty centuries, if not more, had been at work to mould it as it is. Prophets and poets, lawyers and lawgivers, heroes and historians, have thought, lived, fought and died just to have it spelled thus! For indeed, is it not the resultant of countless actions—now conflicting, now commingling, now co-operating—of our whole race? Hindutva is not a word but a history. Not only the spiritual or religious history of our people as at times it is mistaken to be by being confounded with the other cognate term Hinduism, but a history in full. Hinduism is only a derivative, a fraction, a part of Hindutva. Unless it is made clear what is meant by the latter, the first remains unintelli gible and vague. Failure to distinguish between these two terms has given rise to much misunderstanding and mutual

suspicion between some of those sister communities that have inherited this inestimable and common treasure of our Hindu civilization. What is the fundamental difference in the meaning of these two words would be clear as our argument proceeds. Here it is enough to point out that Hindutva is not identical with what is vaguely indicated by the term Hinduism. By an 'ism' is generally meant a theory or a code more or less based on spiritual or religious dogma or system. But when we attempt to investigate into the essential significance of Hindutva we do not primarily—and certainly not mainly—concern ourselves with any particular theocratic or religious dogma or creed. Had not linguistic usage stood in our way then "Hinduness" would have certainly been a better word than Hinduism as a near parallel to Hindutva. Hindutva embraces all the departments of thought and activity of the whole Being of our Hindu race. Therefore, to understand the significance of this term Hindutva, we must first understand the essential meaning of the word Hindu itself and realize how it came to exercise such imperial sway over the hearts of millions over millions of mankind and won a loving allegiance from the bravest and best of them. But before we can do that, it is imperative to point out that we are by no means attempting a definition or even a description of the more limited, less satisfactory and essentially sectarian term Hinduism. How far we can succeed or are justified in doing that would appear as we proceed.

II

Although it would be hazardous at the present stage of oriental research to state definitely the period when the foremost band of the intrepid Aryans made it their home and lighted their first sacrificial fire on the banks of the Sindhu, the Indus, yet certain it is that long before the ancient Egyptians, and Babylonions had built their magnificient civilization, the holy waters of the Indus were daily witnessing the lucid and curling columns of the scented sacrificial smokes and the valleys resounding the chants of Vedic hymns—the spiritual ferver that animated their souls. The adventurous valour that propelled their intrepid enterprizes, the sublime heights to which their thoughts rose—all these had marked them out as a people destined to lay the foundation of a great and enduring civilization. By the time they had definitely cut themselves aloof from their cognate and neighbouring people, especially the Persians, the Aryans had spread out to the furthest of the seven rivers—" the सप्तसिंधुs" —and not only had they developed a sense of nationality but had already succeeded in giving it 'a local habitation and a name !' Out of their gratitude to the genial and perennial network of waterways that ran through the land like a system of nerve-threads and wove them into a Being, they very naturally took to themselves the name of " सप्तसिंधुs "—an epithet that was applied to the whole of Vedic India in the oldest records of the world—the Rigveda itself. Aryans or the cultivators as they essentially were, we can well

understand the divine love and homage they bore to these seven rivers presided over by 'the River'—'the Sindhu,' which to them were but a visible symbol of the common nationality and culture :—इमा आपः शिवतमा इमा राष्ट्रस्य भेषजी : । इमा राष्ट्रस्य वर्धनीरिमा राष्ट्रभृतोपमा : ॥

The Indians in their forward march had yet to meet many a river as genial and as fertilizing as these but, never could they forget the attachment they felt and the homage they paid to the सप्तसिंधुs which had welded them into a nation and furnished the name which enabled their forefathers to voice forth their sense of national and cultural unity. Down to this day a सिंधु—a हिंदु—wherever he may happen to be, will gratefully remember and symbolically invoke the presence of these rivers that they may refresh and purify his soul. इमं मे गंगे यमुने सरस्वाति शुतुद्रिस्तोमं सचता परुष्ण्या । असिक्न्या:मरुद्वृधे वितस्तयार्जीकीये श्रुणुह्या सुषोमया ॥ गंगे च यमुने चैव गोदावरि सरस्वाति ॥ नर्मदे सिंधु कावेरि जलेस्मिन् सान्निधिं कुरु ॥

Not only had these people been known to themselves as "Sindhus" but we have definite records to show that they were known to their surrounding nations—at any rate to one of them—by that very name—"सप्तसिंधु" The syllable स (*s*) in Sanskrit is at times changed into ह (*h*) in some of the Prakrit languages, both Indian and non-Indian. For example the word सप्त has become हप्त not only in Indian Prakrits but also in the European languages too; we have हप्ता *i.e.,* a week, in India and 'Heptarchy' in Europe. केसरी in Sanskrit becomes केहरी in old Hindi. सरस्वती becomes हरहवती in Persian and असुर becomes अहुर. And

then we actually find that the Vedic name of our nation सप्तसिंधु had been mentioned as हप्तहिंदु in the Avesta by the ancient Persian people. Thus in the very dawn of history we find ourselves belonging to the nation of the सिंधुs or Hindus and this fact was well known to our learned men even in the Puranic period. In expounding the doctrine that many of the म्लेच्छ tongues had been but the mere offshoots of the Sanskrit language the भविष्य पुराण clearly cites this fact and says—संस्कृतस्यैव वाणी तु भारतं वर्षमुह्यताम् । अन्यखंडे गता सैव म्लेच्छाह्यानंदिनोऽभवन् । पितृ पैतर भ्राताच वादरः पतिरेवच । सेति सा यावनी भाषा ह्यश्वश्वास्यस्तथा पुनः । जानुस्थाने जैनुशब्दः सप्तसिंधुस्तथैव च । हप्ताहिंदुर्यावनी च पुन ज्ञेया गुरुंडिका ॥ (प्रतिसर्गपर्व अ. ५)
Thus knowing for certain that the Persians used to designate the Vedic Aryans as Hindus and knowing also the fact that we generally call a foreign and unknown people by the term by which they are known to those through whom we come to know them, we can safely conclude that most of the remoter nations that flourished then must have applied the same epithet Hindu to our land and people as the ancient Persians did. Not only that, but even in the very region of the सप्तसिंधुs the thinly scattered native tribes too, must have been knowing the Aryans as हिंदुs in the local dialects in accordance with the same linguistic law. Further on, as the Vedic Sanskrit began to give birth to the Indian Prakrits which became the spoken tongues of the majority of the decendants of these very सिंधुs as well as the assimilated and the cross-born castes, these too might have called themselves as Hindus without any influence from the foreign people. For,

the Sanskrit स changes into ह as often in Indian Prakrits as in the non-Indian ones. Therefore so far as definite records are concerned it is indisputably clear that the first and almost the cradle name chosen by the Patriarches of our race to designate our nation and our people is सप्तसिंधु or हप्तहिंदु and that almost all nations of the then known world seemed to have known us by this very epithet सिंधुs or हिंदु s.

So far we have been treading on solid ground of recorded facts but now we cannot refrain ourselves from making an occasional excursion into the borderland of conjucture. So far we have not pinned our faith to any theory about the original home of the Aryans. But if the most widely accepted theory of their entrance into India be relied on then a natural curiosity arises as to the origin of the names by which they called the new scenes of their adopted home. Did they coin all those names from their own tongue ? Could they have done so ? Is it not generally true that when we meet a new scene or enter a new country we call them by the very names—may be in a slightly changed form so as to suit our vocal ability or taste—by which they are known to the native people there ? Of course, at times we love to call new scenes by names redolent with the memory of the clear old ones—especially when new colonies are being established in a virgin and but thinly populated continent. But this explanation could only be satisfactory when it is proved that the name given to the new place already existed in the old country and even then it could not be denied that the other process of calling new scenes by the names which they already

bear is more universally followed. Now we know it for certain that the region of the सप्तसिंधुs was, though very thinly, populated by scattered tribes. Some of them seem to have been friendly towards the new-comers and it is almost certain that many an individual had served the Aryans as guides and introduced them to the names and nature of the new scenes to which the Aryans could not be but local strangers. The "विद्याधराप्सरोयक्षरक्षोगंधर्वकिन्नराः" were not all or altogether enemical to the Aryans as, at times they are mentioned as being benevolent and good natured folks. Thus it is probable that many names given to these great rivers by the original inhabitants of the soil may have been sanskritised and adopted by the Aryans. We have numerous proofs of this nature in later assimilative expansion of those people & their tongues: witness the words शलकंटकटा, मलय, मिलिंद, अलसंदा (Alexandria) सुलूव (Selucus) etc. If this be true then it is quite probable that the great Indus was known as हिंदु to the original inhabitants of our land and owing to vocal peculiarity of the Aryans it got changed into सिंधु when they adopted it by the operation of the same rule that स् is at times the Sanskritised equivalent of ह्. Thus हिंदु would be the name that this land and the people that inhabited it bore from time so immemorial that even the Vedic name सिंधु is but a later and secondary form of it. If the epithet सिंधु dates its antiquity in the glimmering twilight of History then the word हिंदु dates its antiquity from a period so remoter than the first that even mythology fails to penetrate to—trace it to its source.

The activities of so intrepid a people as the सिंधुs or Hindus could no longer be kept cooped or cabined within the narrow compass of the पंचनद or the Punjab. The vast and fertile plains further stood out inviting the efforts of some strong and vigorous race. Tribe after tribe of the Hindus issued forth from the land of their Nursery and led by the consciousness of a great mission and their Sacrificial Fire that was symbol thereof, they soon reclaimed the vast, wasted and but very thinly populated lands. Forests were felled, agriculture flourished, cities rose, kingdoms thrived,—the touch of human hand changed the whole face of the wild and unkempt nature. But while these great deeds were being achieved the Aryans had developed to suit their individualistic tendencies and the demands of their new environments a polity that was but loosely centralised. As time passed on, the distances of their new colonies increased, and different peoples of other highly developed types began to be incorporated into their culture, the different settlements began to lead a life politically very much centred in themselves. The new attachments formed, though they could not efface the old ones, yet grew more and more pronounced and powerful until the ancient generalizations and names gave way to the new. Some called themselves कुरुs other काशीs or विदेहs or मगधs while the old generic name of the Sindhus or Hindus was first overshadowed and then almost forgotten. Not that the conception of a national and cultural unity vanished but it assumed other names and other forms, the politically most important of them being the institution of a चक्रवर्तिन्.

At last the great mission which the Sindhus had undertaken of founding a nation and a country, found and reached its geographical limit when the Valorous Prince of Ayodhya made a triumphant entry in Ceylon and actually brought the whole land from the Himalayas to the Seas under one sovereign sway. The day when the Horse of Victory returned to Ayodhya unchallenged and unchallengable, the great white Umbrella of Sovereignity was unfurled over the Imperial throne of Ramachandra the brave, Ramchandra the good, and a loving allegiance to him was sworn, not only by the Princes of Aryan blood but Hanuman—Sugriva—Bibhishana from the south—that day was the real birth-day of our Hindu people. It was truly our national day: for Aryans and Anaryans knitting themselves into a people were born as a nation.—It summed up and politically crowned the efforts of all the generations that preceded it and it handed down a new and common mission, a common banner, a common cause which all the generations after it had consciously or unconsciously fought and died to defend.

A synthetic conception gains in strength if it finds a term comprehensive enough to give it an eloquent expression. Those terms आर्यावर्त or ब्रह्मवर्त were not so suitable as to express the vast synthesis that embraced the whole continent from the Indus to the sea and aimed to weld it into a nation. आर्यावर्त as defined by the ancient writers was the land that lay between the Himalaya and the Vindhya. "आर्यावर्तः पुण्यभूमिर्मध्यं विन्ध्याहिमालयोः" ॥ And athough it was best suited to the circumstances which gave it birth, yet and therefore, it could

not serve as a common name to a people that had welded Aryans and Non-Aryans into a common race and had carried their culture—empire—far beyond the bending summits of Vindhyadri. This necessity of finding a suitable term to express the expansive thought of an Indian Nation was more or less effectively met when the house of Bharat came to exercise its sway over the entire world. Without entering into speculations as to who this Bharat was—the Vedic Bharat or the Jain one—or what was the exact period at which he ruled, it is here enough for us to know that his name had been not only the accepted but the cherished epithet by which the people of आर्यावर्त and दाक्षिणापथ delighted to call their common motherland and their common cultural empire. Thus as the horizen opened out to the South we find that the centre of gravity had very naturally shifted from the सप्तसिंधुस to the Gangetic Delta and the name सप्तसिंधु or आर्यावर्त or दक्षिणापथ gave way to the politically grander expression भरतखंड which included in its sweep all that lay between the Himalayas and the Seas. This is most clearly indicated by the definition of our Nation attempted at a period when the vast conception must have been dawning over the minds of our great thinkers. We have met with no better attempt to define our position as a people than the terse little couplet in the विष्णुपुराण "उत्तरयत्समुद्रस्य हिमाद्रेश्चैव दक्षिणम्। वर्षं तद्भारतं नाम भारती यत्र संतातिः॥"

But this new word भारतवर्ष could not altogether suppress our cradle name सिंधुस or हिंदुस nor could it make us forget the love we bore to that River of rivers—the सिंधु at

whose breast our patriarchs and people had drunk the milk of life. Our frontier provinces which bordered the course of Indus still clung to their ancient name सिंधुराष्ट्र. And throughout the Sanskrit literature we find सिंधुसौवीरs recognised as an integral and an important part of our body politic. In the great Mahabharat war the king of सिंधुसौवीर figures prominently and is said to have been closely related to the Bharats. Although the limits of the सिंधुराष्ट्र shifted from time to time, yet the langauge that the people speak—did then and does even now mark them out as a people by themselves—from Multan to the sea, and the name 'सिंधी' which it bears is an emphatic reminder that all those who speak it are सिंधुs and are entitled to be recognised as a geographical and political unit in the common-wealth of our Indian people. Although the epithet भरतखंड succeeded in almost overshadowing the cradle name of our nation in India, yet the foreign nations seem to have cared little for it and as our frontier provinces continued to be known by their ancient name, so even our immediate neighbours—the Avestic Persians, the Jews, the Greeks and others clung to our ancient name सिंधुs or Hindus. They did not merely indicate the borderland of Indus by this term as in days gone by, but the whole nation into which the ancient सिंधुs by expansion and assimilation had grown. The Avestic Persians know us as Hindus, the Greeks dropping the harsh accent as Indos and through the Greeks almost all Europe and later on America as हिंदुs or Indians. Even Huent Sung who lived so long with us persists in calling us शिंदुs or हिंदुs. Barring

a few examples as that of Afganisthan being called as श्वेत-भारत by the Parthians, very rarely indeed had the foreigners forgotten our cradle name or prefered the new one भारतto it. Down to this day the whole world knows us as "Hindus" and our land as "Hindusthan" as if in fulfilment of the wishes of our Vedic fathers who were first to make that choice.

But a name by its nature is determined not so much by what one likes to call oneself but generally by what others like to do. In fact a name is called into existence for this very purpose. Self is known to itself immutably and without a name or even without a form. But when it comes in contact or conflict with a non-self then alone it stands in need of a name if it wants to communicate with others or if others persist in communicating with it. It is a game that requires two to play at. If the world insists that a teacher or a wit must be handed down as an 'अष्टावक्र' or a 'मुल्ला दोप्याजा' well then he, inspite of his liking, is very likely to be remembered as such. If the name chosen by the world for us is not directly against our liking then it is yet more likely to shadow all other names we might bear witness 'पागे', 'मुजुमदार', 'पेशवे'. But if the world hits upon a word by which they would know us as one redolent of our glory or our early love then that word is certain not only to shadow but to survive every other name we may have. This fact added to the circumstances which brought us first into close contact and then into a fierce conflict with the world at large, soon enabled the epithet Hindu to assert itself once more and so vigorously as to push into the background even the well beloved name of भरतखंड itself.

III

Although Indians were by no means cut off from the outside world before the rise of Buddhism and although their world activities had already assumed such dimensions as to give a just occassion to our patriotic poet law-givers to claim "एतद्देशप्रसूतस्य सकाशादग्रजन्मनः। स्वं स्वं चरित्रं शिक्षेरन् पृथिव्यां सर्वमानवाः। (मनु) yet as far as the present argument is concerned, the international life of India, after the rise of Buddhism, requires chiefly to be considered. Because it was about this time when political enterprise having exposed or exhausted all possibilities of expansion in our own land naturally began to overflow its limits to an extent unevidenced before and the communications with the outside world grew more intense and more extensive than in the days gone by. Not only this but outsiders began to knock at our doors more impudently and even imperatively than they ever had done. In addition to these political developements the great and divine mission that set in motion " the wheel of the law of Righteousness" made India the very heart—the very soul—of almost all the then known world. To countless millions of human souls from Misar to Mexico, the land of the Sindhus came to be the land of their Gods and Godmen. Thousands of pilgrims from distant shores poured into this country and thousands of scholars, preachers, sages and saints went from this land to all the then known world. But as the outside world persisted in recognising us by our ancient name " Sindhu " or " Hindu " both these in-coming and outgoing processes

helped mightily to render that epithet to be the most prominent of our national names. The necessity of political and deplomatic correspondence with various states, who knew us as Hindus or Indus, must also have, by making it incumbent on our people to respond to it, revived the use of this epithet first side by side with and then at times even instead of the name Bharatkhand.

But if the rise of Buddhism had thus enabled this epithet to grow in prominence through-out the world and made us more and more conscious of ourselves as Hindus, then strange to say the fall of Buddhism only carried this process further than ever.

We fear that the one telling factor that contributed to the fall of Buddhism more than any other has escaped that detailed attention of scholars which it deserves. But as the subject in hand does but remotely involve its treatment here we cannot treat it here in full. All that we can do here is to make a few general remarks and leave them to be expounded and detailed out to a more favourable occasion if the work be not done by others better fitted to do it. Can it be that philosophical differences alone could have made our nation turn against Buddhism? Not wholly:—for, these differences had been there all along and even flourished side by side with each other. Can it be the general inanition and demoralization of the Buddhistic church itself? Not wholly:—for, if some of the Vihars sheltered a loose, lazy and promiscuous crowd of men and women who lived on others and spent what was not theirs on disreputable persuits of

life yet, on the other hand the line of those spiritual giants of Arhats and Bhikkuz had not altogether ended : nor had such scenes been peculiar to the Buddhistic Vihars alone! All these and many other short-comings would not have attracted such fierce attention and proved fatal to Buddhistic power in India had not the political consequences of the Buddhistic expansion been so disastrous to the national virility and even the national existence of our race. No prelude to a vast tragedy could be more dramatic in its effect in foreshadowing the culminating catastrophy than that incident in the life of the Shakya Sinha when the news of the fate of the little tribal republic of the Shakyas was carried to their former Prince when he was just laying the foundation stone of the Buddhistic church. He had already enrolled the flower of his clan in his Bhikku-sangha and the little Shakya Republic thus deprived of its bravest and best, fell an easy victim to the strong and warlike, in the very life time of the Shakya Sinha. The news when carried to him is said to have left the Enlightened unconcerned. Centuries rolled on : the Prince of the Shakyas had grown into the Prince of Princes—the Lokjit—the great conqueror of worlds. The confines of his little Shakya state expanded and embraced the confines of India ; and as if to give a touch of poetical precision and poetical justice, the woeful fate that had overtaken the tribal republic of Kapil-Vastu befell the whole of Bharatvarsha itself and it fell an easy prey to the strong and warlike—not like Shakyas of their own kith and kin but—the Lichis and Huns! Of course the Enlighten

ed would perhaps remain as unaffected as ever even if this news could ever reach him like the first. But the rest of Hindus than could not drink with equanimity this cup of bitterness and political servitude at the hands of those, whose barbarous violence could ill be soothed by the mealy mouthed formulas of अहिंसा and spiritual brother-hood, and whose steel could ill be blunted by the soft palm leaves and rhymed charms. We do not mean to underrate—much less accuse—the services of the great brotherhood and its Divine Mission. We have only to point out the concomitance that is too glaring to escape the attention of any student of History. We know that it could easily be pressed against this statement that, the greatest and even powerful Indian Kings and Emperor known, belong to the Buddhist period. Yes—but known to whom ?—to the Europeans and those of us who have unconsciously imbibed not only their thoughts but even their prejudices. There was a time when every school history in India opened from the Mahomedan invasion because the average English writers of that time knew next to nothing of our earlier life. Lately the general knowledge of Europe has extended backwards to the rise of Buddhism and we too are apt to look upon it as the first and even the most glorious epoch of our history. The fact is, it is neither. We yield to none in our love and admiration and respect for the Buddha—the Dharma—the Sangha. They are all ours. Their glories are ours and ours their failures. Great was Ashoka the Devapriya, and greater were the achievements of Buddhistic Bhikshus. But achieve-

ments as great if not greater and things as holy and more politic and statesmanly had gone before them and indeed enabled them to be what they were. So, we do not think that the political virility or the manly nobility of our race began and ended with the Mauryas alone—or was a consequence of their embracing Buddhism. Buddhism has conquests to claim but they belong to a world far removed from this our matter-of-fact world—where feet of clay do not stand long, and steel could be easily sharpened, and तृष्णा—thirst—is too powerful and real to be quenched by painted streams that flow perennially—in heavens. These must have been the considerations that must have driven themselves home to the hearts of our patriots and thinkers when the Huns and Shaks poured like volcanic torrents and burnt all that thrived. The Indians saw that the cherished ideals of their race—their thrones and their families and the very Gods they worshipped—trampled under foot, the holy land of their love devastated and sacked by hordes of barbarians so inferior to them in language, religion, philosophy, mercy and all the soft and human attributes of man and God ;—but superior to them in strength alone !—strength that summed up its creed. in two words—Fire and Sword ! The inference was clear. Clear also was the fact that Buddhistic logic had no argument that could effeciently meet this new and terrible dualism—this द्वैत, this strange bible of Fire and Steel. So the leaders of thought and action of our race had to rekindle their Sacrificial Fire to oppose the Sacrilegious One—to re-open the mines of Vedic fields for steel—to get it sharpened on the

altar of काली —"the Terrible", so that महाकाल —the "Spirit of the Times" be appeased. Nor were their anticipations belied. The success of the renovated Hindu arms was undisputed and indisputable. Vikramaditya who drove the foreigners from the Indian soil and Lalitaditya who caught and chastised them in their very dens from Tartary to Mongolia—were but compliments of each other. Valour had accomplished what formulas had failed to do. Once more the people rose to the heights of greatness that shed its lustre on all departments of life. Poetry and philosophy, art and architecture, agriculture and commerce, thought and action felt the quickening impulse which consciousness of Independance and strength and Victory alone can radiate. The reaction as usaul was complete even to a fault. " Up with the Vedic Dharma !" "Back to the Vedas !" The national cry grew louder and louder, more and more imperative, because this was essentially a political necessity.

Buddhism had made first and yet the greatest attempt to propagate a universal religion. " Go, ye Bhikkus, to all the ten directions of the world and preach the law of Righteousness !" Truly, it was a law of Righteousness—it had no ulterior end in view, no lust for land or lucre quickening its steps; and grand though its achievements were it could not eradicate the seeds of animal passions nor of political ambitions nor of individual aggrandisement in the minds of all men to such an extent as to make it safe for India to change her Sword for a Rosary. Even then, to set an example, did India declare her will to " take more pleasure in the con-

quests of peace and righteousness than in the conquests of arms." Nobly she tried : ah ! so nobly as to make herself ridiculous in the eyes of Lust and Lucre :—had she not issued Royal edicts to the effect that the very water be strained before it was poured out for horses and elephants to drink, so as to enable the tiny lives in the waters to escape immediate death? and had she not opened corn-throwing centres in the midst of the seas that fish be fed in her oceans, while men had not ceased to feed on fish in other oceans of the world, nor had the very fish ceased to feed on each other ! Nobly did she try to kill killing by getting killed—and at last found out that palm leaves at times are too fragile for steel ! As long as the whole world was red in tooth and claw and the national and racial distinctions so strong as to make men brutal, so long if India had to live at all a life whether spiritual or political according to the light of her soul, she must not loose the strength born of national and racial cohesion. So the leaders of thought and action grew sick of repeating the mumbos and umbos of Universal Brotherhood and, bitterly complained—

"ये त्वया देव निहिता असुराश्चैव विष्णुना। ते जाता म्लेच्छरूपेण पुनरद्य महीतले॥ व्यापादयन्ति ते विप्रान् घ्नंति यज्ञादिका: क्रिया:। हरन्ति मुनिकन्याश्च पापा: किं किं न कुर्वंति॥ म्लेच्छाक्रांते च भूलोके निर्वषट्कारमंगले। यज्ञयागादि विच्छेदाद्देवलोकोऽवसीदति॥ (गुणाढ्य)" And when the barbarian hordes of the Shaks and the Huns—who had ravaged their fair land that had in utter confidence clad herself in a Bhikkus' dress, changed her Sword for Rosary and had taken to the vows of अहिंसा and non-violence—were

expelled beyond Indus and further, and a strong national state was firmly established, then it was but natural that the leaders of our race should have realized what an immense amount of strength could be derived if but the new national state was backed up by a Church as intensely national.

Moreover every thing that is common in us with our enemies weakens our power of opposing them. The foe that has nothing in common with us is the foe likely to be most bitterly resisted by us, just as a friend that has almost everything in him which we admire and prize in ourselves is likely to be the friend we love most. The necessity of creating a bitter sense of wrong and invoking a power of undying resistance especially in India that had under the opiates of Universalism and Non-violence lost the faculty even of resisting sin and crime and aggression, could best be accomplished by cutting off even the semblance of a common worship—a common Church, which required her to clasp the hand of those as her co-religionists whose had been the very hand that had strangled her as a nation. What was the use of a universal faith that instead of soothening the ferociousness and brutal egoism of other nations only excited their lust by leaving India defenceless and unsuspecting? No; the only safe guards in future were valour and strength that could only be born of a national self-consciousness. She had poured her life's blood for sophistry that tried to prove otherwise!

The reaction against the universal tendencies of Buddhism only grew more insistent and powerful as the attempt to re-establish the Buddhist power in India began to assume a

more threatening attitude. Nationalist tendencies refused to barter with our national independance and accept a foreign conquerer as our over-Lord. But if that foreign invader happened to be favourably inclined towards Buddhism, then he was sure to find some secret sympathisers in the Indian Buddhists all over India : even as Catholic Spain could always find some important section in England to sympathise with their efforts to restore a Catholic dynasty in England. Not only this but dark hints abound in our ancient records to show that at times some foreign Buddhistic powers had actually invaded India with an express national and religious aim in view. We cannot treat the history of this period exhaustively here but can only point to the half symbolic and half actual description given in one of our Puranas of the war waged on the आर्यदेशजाः by the न्यूनपति (the king of the Huns) and his Buddhistic allies. The record tells us in a mythological strain how a big battle was fought on the banks of the river "हहा", how the Buddhistic forces made China the basis of operation "(चीनदेशमुपागम्य युद्धभूमिरकारयत्)," how they were reinforced by contingents from many Buddhistic nations: श्यामदेशोद्भवा लक्षास्तथा लक्षाश्च जापकाः। दशलक्षाश्चीनदेश्या युद्धाय समुपस्थिताः॥" and how after a tough fight the Buddhists lost it and paid heavily for their defeat. They had formally to renounce all ulterior national aims against India and give a pledge that they would never again enter India with any political end in view. The Buddhists as individuals had nothing to fear from India—the land of toleration—but they should give up all dreams of endangering the national

life of India and her independance "सर्वैश्च बौद्धवृंदैश्च तत्रैव शपथं कृतम्। आर्यदेशं न यास्यामः कदाचिद्राष्ट्रहेतवे॥ (भविष्यपुराण प्रतिसर्गपर्व).

And thus we find that institutions that were the peculiar marks of our nation were revived:—वर्णाश्रमव्यवस्था which could not be wiped away even under the Buddhistic sway, grew in popularity to such an extent that kings and emperors felt it a distinction to be called "वर्णव्यवस्थापनपरः" (सोनपत ताम्रलेख)—"वर्णाश्रमव्यवस्थापनप्रवृत्तचक्रः" (मधवत ताम्रपट). Reaction in favour of this institution grew so strong that our nationality was almost getting identified with it. Witness the definition that tries to draw a line of demarcation between us and foreigners "चातुर्वर्ण्यव्यवस्थानं यस्मिन्देशे न विद्यते। तं म्लेच्छदेशं जानीयादार्यावर्तस्ततः परम् ॥." From this it was but a natural step to prohibit our people from visiting shores which were uncongenial—in some cases fiercely hostile—to such peculiar institutions as these and where our people could not be expected to receive the protection that would enable to keep up the spirit and letter of our faith. Reckless as the reaction was, it was perfectly intelligible when viewed at politically; for, do we not frequently meet with patriotic thinkers even now in our land who would stand for laws prohibiting our men from emigrating to nations where they are sure to be subjected to national disabilities and dishonours?

Thus it was political and national necessity that was at once the cause and the effect of the decline of Buddhism in India. Buddhism had its geographical centre of gravity nowhere. So it was an imperative need to restore at least the national centre of gravity that India had lost in attempt-

ing to get identified with Buddhism. When the nation grew intensely selfconscious as an organism would do and was in direct conflict with the non-self, it instinctively turned to draw the line of division and mark well the position it occupied so as to make it clear to themselves where they exactly stood and to the world how they were unmistakebly a people by themselves—not only a racial and a national but even a geographical and political unit. On the southern side of our country the natural and stratagic limits were already reached, sanctioned and sanctified. The frame-work of the deep and boundless seas in which our southern peninsula is set is almost poetical in its grace and perfection. The "समुद्ररशना" had pleased the eyes of generations of our poets and patriots. But on the north western sides of our nation the commingling of races was growing rather too unceremonious to be healthy and our frontiers too shifty to be safe. Therefore it would have been a matter of surprise if the intense spirit of self-assertion that had found so benigh an asylum under the patronage of the महाकाल of Ujjain had not made our patriots turn to this pressing necessity of drawing a frontier line for us that would be as vivid as effective. And what could that line be but the vivacious yet powerful stream—the River of rivers—the "सिंधु"? The day on which the patriarchs of our race had crossed that stream they ceased to belong to the people they had definitely left behind and laid the foundation of a new nation—were reborn into a new people that, under the quieting star of new hope and new mission, were destined by assimilation and by

expansion to grow into a race and a new polity that could only be most fittingly and feelingly described as सिंधु or हिंदु.

Nor was this attempt to identify our frontier line with the river Indus an innovation. In fact it was but the natural consequence of the great war-cry of the national revivalists "Back to the Vedas." The Vedic State based on and backed up by the Vedic Church must be designated by the Vedic name, and—so far as it was then possible—identified with the Vedic lines. And this process of events which the very general trend of history should have enabled us to anticipate seems to have actually gone through. For one of our patriotic पुराणाs assures us that शालिवाहन, the grandson of the great विक्रमादित्य, after having defeated the second attempt of foreigners to rush in and expelled them beyond the Indus, issued a Royal Decree to the effect that thenceforth the Indus should constitute the line of demarcation between India and other non-Indian nations: "एतस्मिन्नंतरे तत्र शालिवाहनभूपतिः। विक्रमादित्यपौत्रश्च पितृराज्यं प्रपेदिरे ॥ जित्वा शकान् दुराधर्षान् चीनतैत्तिरिदेशजान्। बाल्हिकान् कामरुपांश्च रोमजान् खुरजान् शठान् ॥ तेषां कोशान् गृहित्वाच दंडयोग्यानकारयत्। स्थापिता तेन मर्यादा म्लेच्छार्याणां पृथक् पृथक् ॥ सिंधुस्थानमितिज्ञेयं राष्ट्रमार्यस्य चोत्तमम्। म्लेच्छस्थानं परं सिंधोः कृतं तेन महात्मना ॥ (भविष्यपुराण, प्रतिसर्ग पर्व अ. २).

The most ancient of the names of our country of which we have a record is सप्तसिंधु or सिंधु. Even भारतवर्ष is and must necessarily be a latter designation, besides being personal in its appeal. The glories of a person however magnificient, loose their glamour as time passes on. The name that recommends itself by appealing to such personal glo-

ries and achievements, can never be so effective and permanent a source of ever rising consciousness of gratitude and pride as a name that, besides being reminiscent of such national achievements and beloved personal touches, is in addition to it associated with some great beneficient and perennial natural phenomena. The emperor Bharat is gone and gone also many an emperor as great !—but the सिंधु goes on for ever: for ever inspiring and fertillising our sense of gratitude ,vivifying our sense of pride, renovating the ancient memories of our race,—a sentinal keeping watch over the destinies of our people. It is the vital spinal cord that connects the remotest past to the remotest future. The name that associates and identifies our nation with a river like that, enlists nature on our side and bases our national life on a foundation that is, so far as human calculations are concerned, as lasting as eternity. All these considerations must have fired the imaginations of the then leaders of thought and action and made them restore the ancient Vedic name of our land and nation सिंधुस्थान—the "राष्ट्रमार्यस्य चोत्तमम् ।"

The epithet सिंधुस्थान besides being Vedic had also a curious advantage which could only be called lucky and yet is too substantial to be ignored. The word सिंधु in संस्कृत does not only mean the Indus but also the sea—" समुद्ररशना " which girdles southern peninsula—so that this one word सिंधु points out almost all the frontiers of our land at a single stroke. Even if we do not accept the tradition that the river ब्रह्मपुत्रा is only a branch of the सिंधु which falls in two flowing streams on the eastern and western slopes of the Himla

-yas and thus constitutes both our eastern as well as western frontiers, still it is indisputably true that it circumscribes our northern and western extremities in its sweep and so the epithet सिंधुस्थान calls up the image of our whole Motherland: —the land that lies between सिंधु and सिंधु—from the Indus to the Seas.

But it must not be supposed that the epithet सिंधु recommended itself to our patriots only because it was geographically best fitted. For, we find it emphatically stated that the concept expressed by this word was national and not merely geographical, सिंधुस्थान was not merely a piece of land but it was a राष्ट्र—a nation which was ideally if not always actually a state (राज्ञः राष्ट्रम्). It also clearly followed that the culture that flourished in सिंधुस्थान and the citizens there-of were सिंधुs even as they had been in the Vedic days. सिंधुस्थान was the "राष्ट्रमार्यस्य चोत्तमम् " as distinguished from म्लेच्छस्थान the land of the foreigners. However it must be clearly pointed out that the definition is not based on any theological hair splitting or religious fanaticism. The word आर्य is expressly stated in the very verses to mean all those who had been in-corporated as parts integral in the nation and people that flourished on this our side of the Indus whether वैदिक or अवैदिक, ब्राह्मण or चांडाल, and owned and claimed to have inherited a common culture, common blood, common country and common polity ; while म्लेच्छ also by the very fact of its being put in opposition to सिंधुस्थान meant foreigners nationally and racially and not necessarily religiously.

This Royal Decree was as all Royal Decrees in सिंधुस्थान had generally been, the mere executive outcome of a strong and popular movement. For, the custom of looking upon अटक as the veritable Indian land's end as the very word अटक signifies, could not have been originated and observed so universally and so long, had it not been inspired by and appealing to our national imagination. This custom that is so tenaciously and reverently observed by millions of our people, premiers and peasants alike, is a good proof that strongly corroborates the fact that some such royal edict sanctioning the identification of our frontiers with the ancient सिंधु and associating the name of our land and nation with it as सिंधुस्थान had actually been issued; and that the highest religious sanctification consecrating this royal sanction and popular will must have enabled this attempt to restore the Vedic name of our country to triumph in the end. Of course centuries had yet to pass and momentous events to happen to shape and mould the destinies of these words सिंधु and सिंधुस्थान till they came to be as powerfully influential as to colour the thought of our whole nation and be the cherished possession of our race. But after all they have done it and to-day we find that while thousands would not know what आर्यावर्त or भारतवर्ष exactly means yet the very man in the street will understand and recognize the names हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान as his very own.*

*The verses from भविष्यपुराण quoted above seem to be quite trustworthy so far as their general purport is concerned : firstly, because they record a general tradition that, unlike dates or individual succes-

But before we proceed to state what further developments the history of this epithet had to undergo we feel it incumbent to render an apology to ourselves. We have while writing this section wounded our own feelings. So we hasten to add that the few harsh words we had to say in explaining the political necessity that led to the rejection of Buddhism in India should not be understood to mean that we have not a very high opinion of that Church as a whole! No, no! I am as humble an admirer and an adorer of that great and holy संघ—the holiest the world has ever seen—as

---

sions, can easily be remembered longer. Secondly, independantly of that, the general trend of our history as shown points to some such state of affairs. Thirdly, it is not necessary here for our arguments to be very precise either about the date of this Decree or even the king by whom it was issued; and fourthly, the author does not seem to have been writing about things only half-hazardly or to which he is entirely a stranger. For the family table that he gives of the House of Vikramaditya is again given in other part of the work and the two agree closely with each other. The writer who knows of details about the House is likely to know the *Salient* facts of the most distinguished king that belonged to it.

After all, the main resources of our history had been and must ever be our national traditions remembered or recorded in our ancient Puranas, Epics and Literature. Their details may be challenged, their dates determined and rejected, but on account of discrepancies here or miraculous coloring there which are in fact common to all ancient records of mankind we cannot dismiss them altogether; especially where the facts recorded have not an impossible or unnatural element in them or when they do not contradict events otherwise proved to be indisputably true. The habit of doubting every thing in the Puranas till it has been corroborated by some

any of its initiated worshipper. We are not initiated, not because the संघ is not worthy of us but because we are not worthy of stepping on the footsteps of the Temple—that has lasted longer because it rested on ideas than many a great palace that rested on rocks. The consciousness that the first great and the most successful attempt to wean man of the brute inherent in him was conceived, launched and carried on from century to century by a galaxy of great teachers—Arhats and Bhikkus who were born in India, who were bred in India

---

foreign evidence is absurd. The sounder process would be to depend on our works especially where general traditions and events are concerned till they are found to be unreliable in the light of any more weighty and less ambiguous evidence and not simply on account of the airy imaginings of some one to whom 'it does not seem probable'! Take the case of this भविष्यपुराण itself : because it contains some inaccuracies and even absurdities—and is Plutarch free from them ? are we to reject the personality of Alexander himself because of the supernatural touches given to the story of his birth ? Would it be reasonable to doubt, say, the following verse: चंद्रगुप्तस्तस्य सुतः पौरस्याधिपतेः सुताम् । सुलवस्य तथोद्वाह्य यावनीं बौद्धतत्परः ?। In fact we owe a debt of gratitude to these Puranas and Epics for having preserved all ancient and venerable records of our people through revolutions which had effaced the very traces of whole nations and whole civilizations else where in the world. For, after all these records of our ancient and patriotic पुराणs and इतिहासs are at any rate more faithful, more accurate and more reliable than the modern up-to-date western पुराणs that have such convincing discoveries to their credit as the one which assures us that रामायण sings of the foundation of विजयानगर or the other which asserts that गौतम—the Buddha was merely the sun or the dawn personified !!

and who owned India as the land of their worship–fills us with feelings too deep for words. And if these be our feelings for the संघ then what shall we say about its great Founder—the Buddha—the Enlightened ? I, the humblest of the humble of mankind can dare to approach thee, Oh तथागत ! with no other offerings but my utter humility and my utter emptiness! Although I feel that I fail to catch the purport of thy words, yet I know that it must be so. Because while thy words are gathered from the lips of Gods, mine ears and my understandings are trained to the accents and the din of this matter-of-fact world. Perhaps it was too soon for thee to sound thy march and unfurl thy banner while the world was too young and the day but just risen! It fails to keep pace with thee and its sight gets dazzled and dimmed to keep the radiance of thy banner in full view. As long as the law of evolution that lays down the iron command " चलानामचला भक्ष्या दंष्ट्रणामप्यदंष्ट्रणः । अहस्तानां सहस्ताश्च शूराणां चैव भीरवः ॥ (मनु)" is too persistent and dangerously imminent to be catagorically denied by the law of righteousness whose mottoes shine brilliantly and beautifully—but as the stars in the heavens do,—so long the banner of Nationality will refuse to be replaced by that of Universality and yet, that very national banner hollowed as it is by the worship of gods and godesses of our race, would have been poorer if it could not have counted the शाक्यसिंह under its fold. But as it is, thou art ours as truly as Shri Ram or Shri Krishna or Shri Mahavir had been and as thy words were but the echoes of yearnings of our national soul, thy visions the dreams of our race, even

so, if ever the law of Righteousness rules triumphant on this our human plane, then thou wilt find that the land that cradled thee, and the people that nursed thee, will have contributed most to bring about that consumation, *if indeed the fact of having contributed thee has not proved that much already!!*

IV

So far we have depended upon संस्कृत records in tracing the growth of the word सिंधु and we have left the thread of our inquiry at the point where the growing concept of an Indian nation was found to be better expressed by the word सिंधुस्थान than by any other existing words. It was precisely to refute any parochial and narrow minded significance which might, as in the case of आर्यावर्त be attached to this word that the definition of the word सिंधुस्थान was rid of any association with a particular institution or party-coloured suggestion. For example आर्यावर्त was according to an authority चातुर्वर्ण्यव्यवस्थानं यस्मिन्देशे न विद्यते । तं म्लेच्छदेशं जानीयादार्यावर्तस्ततःपरम् ॥ This solution, though legitimate, could not be lasting. An institution is meant for the society not the society or its ideal for an institution. The चातुर्वर्ण्यव्यवस्थान may disappear when it had served its end or ceases to serve it, but will that make our land a "म्लेच्छदेश"—a land of foreigners? The संन्यासिन्s, the आर्यसमाजीs, the शिखs, and many others do not recognize the चातुर्वर्ण्यव्यवस्था and yet are they foreigners? God forbid! They are ours by blood, by race, by country, by God. "तं वर्षं भारतं नाम भारती यत्र संतति:" is a definition ten times better because truer than that! We Hindus are all one and a nation, because chiefly of our common blood—"भारती संतति:"

At this period of our history—the rise as well as the fall of Buddhism were accompanied by a remarkable spread and growth of the vernaculars of India and संस्कृत was fast being

shut up in the impenetrable fortresses of classical conventionality to such an extent that new ideas and new names had to be sanskritised before they could be incorporated in any acceptable work. Naturally the every day life and the ever changing phases of national and social activities gradually sought expression through the spoken प्राकृत which thus grew better fitted to convey the living and throbbing thoughts of the people in all their freshness and vigour and precision.. Consequently although the words सिंधु and सिंधुस्थान are at times found in sanskrit works, yet the sanskrit writers generally prefered the word भारत as being more in consonance with the established cannons of elegance. While on the other hand the vernaculars stuck almost exclusively to the more popular and living name of our land हिंदुस्थान [सिंधुस्थान], instead of the ancient and well-beloved names भारत or आर्यावर्त. We need not repeat here how स in संस्कृत gets at times changed into ह in Indian as well as non-Indian प्राकृतs. So we find the living vernacular literature of India full of reference to हिंदुस्थान or हिंदुs. Although the संस्कृत language must ever remain the cherished and sacred possession of our race, contributing most powerfully to the fundamental unity of our people and enriching our life, ennobling our aspirations and purifying the fountains of our being, yet, the honour of being the living spoken national tongue of our people is already won by that प्राकृत, which, being one of the eldest daughters of संस्कृत, is most fittingly called हिंदी or हिंदुस्थानी—the language of the national and cultural descendants of the ancient सिंधुs or हिंदुs. हिंदुस्थानी is

par--excellence the language of हिंदुस्थान or सिंधुस्थान. The attempt to raise Hindi to the pedestal of our national tongue is neither new nor forced. Centuries before the advent of British rule in India we find it recorded in our annals that this was the medium of expression throughout India. A sadhu or merchant starting from Rameshwaram and proceeding to Haridwar, could make himself understood in all parts of India through this tongue. Sanskrit might have introduced him to the circles of Pandits and Princes but Hindustani was a safe and sure passport to the राजसभाs as well as to the bazzars. A Nanak, a Chaitanya, a Ramdas could and did travel up and down the country as freely as they would have done in their own provinces teaching and preaching in this tongue. As the growth and development of this our genuine national tongue was parallel to and almost simultaneous with the revival and popularization of the ancient names सिंधुस्थान or सिंधुस, or हिंदुस्थान or हिंदुस it was but a matter of course that that language being the common possession of the whole nation should be called हिंदुस्थानी or हिंदी.

After expulsion of Huns and the Shaks the valour of her arms left सिंधुस्थान in an undistubred possession of independence for centuries on centuries to come and enabled her once more to be the land where peace and plenty reigned. The blessings of freedom and independance were shared by the princes and peasants alike. The patriotic authors go in rapture over the greatness and the happiness that marked this long chapter of our history extending over nearly a thousand years or so.

"ग्रामे ग्रामे स्थितो देवः देशे देशे स्थितो मखः। गेहे गेहे स्थित द्रव्यं धर्मश्चैव जने जने ॥" (भविष्यपुराण प्रातिसर्गपर्व). From सिंहल (Ceylon) to काश्मीर the Rajputs—a single family of princess—ruled, often connected closely by marriages and more closely by the traditions of chivalry and culture handed down by a common civilization and a common law: The whole life of the nation was being brought into a harmony as rich as divine, and the growth of a national langauge was but an outward expression of this inward unity of our national life.

But as it often happens in history this very undisturbed enjoyment of peace and plenty lulled our सिंधुस्थान, in a sense of false security and bred a habit of living in the land of dreams. At last, she was rudely awakened on the day when Mohamad of Gazani crossed the Indus, the frontier line of सिंधुस्थान, and invaded her. That day the conflict of life and death began. Nothing makes Self conscious of itself so much as the conflict with the non-Self. Nothing can weld peoples into a nation and nations into a state as the pressure of a common foe. Hatred separates as well as unites. Never had सिंधुस्थान a better chance and a more powerful stimulus to be herself forged into an indivisible whole as on that dire day, when the great Iconoclast crossed the Indus. The Mohamedans had crossed that stream even under Kasim but it was a wound only skin-deep, for the heart of our people was not hurt and was not even aimed at. The contest began in grim earnestness with Mohmad and ended—shall we say with Abdalli? From year to year, decade to decade, century to century, the contest continued. Arabia ceased

to be what Arabia was; Iran annihilated; Egypt, Syria, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Tartary,—from Granada to Gazni—nations and civilizations fell in heaps before the sword of Islam–of Peace !! But here for the first time the sword succeeded in striking but not in killing. It grew blunter each time it struck, each time it cut deep but as it was lifted out to strike again the wound stood healed. Vitality of the victim proved stronger than the vitality of the victor. The contrast was not only grim but it was monstrously unequal. It was not a race, a nation or a people India had to struggle with. It was nearly all Asia, quickly to be followed by nearly all Europe. The Arabs had entered Sindh and single-handed they could do little else. They soon failed to defend their own independence in their homeland and as a people we hear nothing further about them. But here India alone had to face Arabs, Persians, Pathans, Baluchis, Tartars, Turks, Moguls—a veritable human Sahara whirling and columning up bodily in a furious world storm ! Religion is a mighty motive force. So is Rapine. But where Religion is goaded on by Rapine and Rapine serves as a hand-maid to Religion, the propelling force that is generated by these together is only equalled by the profoundity of human misery and devastation they leave behind them in their march. Heaven and Hell making a common cause–such were the forces, overwhelmingly furious, that took India by surpirse the day that Mohmad crossed the Indus and invaded her. Day after day, decade after decade, centuries after centuries, the ghastly conflict continued and India single-handed kept the fight morally

and militarily. The moral victory was won when Akbar came to the throne and Darashukoh was born. The frantic efforts of Aurangzib to retrieve their fortunes lost in the moral field only hastened the loss of the military fortunes in the battle--field as well. At last Bhau, as if symbolically, hammered the ceiling of the Imperial Seat of the Moguls to pieces, the day of Panipat rose, the Hindus lost the battle–and won the war. Never again had an Agfan dared to penetrate to Delhi. While the triumphant Hindu banner that our Marathas had carried to the Atak was taken up by our Sikhs and carried across Indus to the banks of the Kabul.

In this prolonged furious conflict our people became intensely conscious of ourselves as Hindus and were welded into a nation to an extent un-known in our history. It must not be forgotten that we have all along referred to the progress of the Hindu movement as a whole and not to that of any particular creed or religious section thereof–of हिंदुत्व and not Hinduism only. Sanatanists, Satnamis, Sikhs, Aryas, Anaryas, Marathas and Madrasis, Brahmins and Panchamas—all suffered as Hindus and triumphed as Hindus. Both friends and foes contributed equally to enable the words Hindu and Hindusthan to supercede all other designations of our land and our people. आर्यावर्त and दक्षिणापथ, जंबुद्वीप and भारतवर्ष none could give so eloquent an expression to the main political and cultural point at issue as the word Hindusthan could do. All those on this side of Indus who claimed the land from सिंधु to सिंधु, from Indus to the seas, as the land of their birth, felt that they were directly mentioned by that

one single expression हिंदुस्थान. The enemies hated us as Hindus and the whole family of peoples and races, of sects and creeds, that flourished from अटक to कटक was suddenly individualised into a single Being. We cannot help dropping the remark that no one has up to this time taken the whole field of Hindu activities from A.D. 1300 to A.D. 1800 into survey from this point of view mastering the details of the various now parallel, now corelated, movements from Kashmere to Ceylon and from Sindh to Bengal, and yet rising higher above them all to visualise the whole scene in its proportion as an intergal whole. For, it was the one great issue to defend the honour and independance of Hindusthan and maintain the cultural unity and civic life of हिंदुत्व, and not Hinduism alone,–but हिंदुत्व i.e., हिंदुधर्म :—that was being fought out on the hundred fields of battle as well as on the floor of the chambers of diplomacy. This one word हिंदुत्व ran like a vital spinal cord through our whole body politic and made the Nayars of Malabar weep over the sufferings of the Brahmins of Kashmere. Our bards bewailed the fall of Hindus, our seers roused the feelings of Hindus, our heroes faught the battles of Hindus, our saints blessed the efforts of Hindus, our statesmen moulded the fate of Hindus, our mothers wept over the wounds and gloried over the triumphs of Hindus.

It would require a volume if we were to substantiate these remarks by quoting all the words and writings of our forefathers that bear on the point. But the argument in hand does not allow us to be drawn aside even by so alluring a task as that . Consequently we must content ourselves with

quoting a few eloquent lines either from the lips or the pen of some of the foremost representatives of our Hindu race.

Of all the works written in the Hindi language, old and new, the great epic "पृथ्वीराज रासो" by Chand Bardai is, so far as present researches go, admittedly the most ancient and authoritative one. There is only one solitary verse which claims to be an earlier composition. But luckily and strangely enough this very first composition in our Northern Vernacular literature refers to the word Hindusthan in terms full of pride and patriotic fervour. The poet वेन, father of चंदवरदाई, addresses the Raja of अजमेर, the father of पृथ्वीराज,:—

अटल ठाट महिपाट, अटल तारागढथानं
अटल नग्र अजमेर, अटल हिंदव अस्थानं
अटल तेज परताप, अटल लंकागढ डंडिय
अटल आप चहुवान, अटल भूमिजस मंडिय
संभरी भूप सोमेसनृप, अटल छत्र ओपै सुसर
कविराव वेन आसीस दे, अटल जगां रजेसकर.

चंदवरदाई, who may justly be called आदिकवि of Hindi Literature, uses the words हिंदु, हिंदवान, हिंद so often and so naturally as to leave no doubt of their being quite common and accepted terms as far back as the eleventh century, when the Mohamadans had not secured any permanent footing even in Punjab and therefore could not have influenced the independent and proud Rajputs to adopt a degrading nick-name invented by their foes, and make it their national and proud appelation. Describing how शहाबुद्दीन taken prisoner by the Hindus, was let go by the noble पृथ्वीराज on condition that he would not again attack the "Hindus," चंद says—

" राखि पंचदिन साहि अदव आदर बहु किन्नौ.
सुज हुसेन गाजी सुपूत हथ्थै ग्रहि दिन्नौ
किय सलाम तिनवार जाहु अपने सुथानह
मति हिंदुपर साहि सज्जि आऔ स्वस्थानह "

(पृ. रासो स. ९)

But शहाबुद्दीन was not a man to be won over by Hindu chivalry. Again and again he sallies forth and fierce fight ensues to the boundless joy of that divine cynic नारदः—

" जब हिंदुदल जोर हुअ छुट्टि मीरधर भ्रम
असमय अरवस्तान चला करन उद्दसाक्रम "

and again, " जुरे हिंदु मीरं, वहे खग्ग तारं,
मुखे मारमारं वहे सूरसारं.

till at last हिंदु म्लेच्छ अघाइ घाइन,
नंचि नारद युद्ध चायन!! "

But in spite of his efforts to crush the Hindus, शहाबुद्दीन lost the day and the triumphant news sent Delhi mad with joy that पज्जूनराय had once more taken शहाबुद्दीन a prisoner. The populace greeted their king पृथ्वीराजः—

" आज भाग चहुआन घर ।
आज भाग हिंदवान ॥
इन जीवित दिल्लीश्वर ।
गंज न सक्कै आन ॥ "

Further pledges solemnly entered by the man who had broken his former pledges as solemnly given, succeeded in securing the release of the Shah once more, and once more, but now for the last time, did he invade Hindusthan and by a fell swoop was almost at the gate of Delhi. The council of war is hurriedly summoned by the "हिंदपति" पृथ्वीराज, insolent

challenge is sent by शहाबुद्दीन, the रावलs and सामंतs are a-flame, when चामुंडराय tells the Mohamedan messenger to remind Shah of the dust he had licked and adds—

" निर्लज्ज म्लेच्छ लजै नही । हम हिंदु लजवान् ॥ "

The fatal day drew near and both the sides knew it was a desparate game. चंदवरदाई almost on the eve of the defection of हम्मीर, approaches the Goddess दुर्गा and opens his prayer, so pathetic and so patriotic thus—

" दुग्गे हिंदुराजान बंदीन आयं
जपै जाप जालधरं तूं सहायं
नमस्ते नमस्ते इ जालंधरानी
सुरं आसुरं नागपूजा प्रमानी. "

After having narrated the fateful results of the battle and consequent plot that enabled पृथ्विराज to strike शहाबुद्दीन dead, the poem ends with paying a last touching tribute to the fallen Hindu Emperror—

" धनि हिंदु प्रथिराज, जिने रजवट्ट उजारिय
धनि हिंदु प्रथिराज, बोल कलिमझ्झ उगारिय
धनि हिंदु प्रथिराज, जेन सुविहान ह संध्यो
बारबारह ग्रहिमुक्कि, अंतकाल सर बंध्यो "

It is remarkable that although the word भारत appears often in the रासो in the sense of महाभारत yet it seldom, if ever, is used in the sense of भारतवर्ष. What we find in this earliest of our northern vernacular composition holds goods in the latter development of our vernacular literature down to the day of the great Hindu Revival and the war of Hindu Liberation. रामदास the high priest and prophet of that movement, in one of his mystical and prophetic utterances sings

of the vision he had seen and triumphantly but thankfully asserts that much of what he had seen in his vision has already come to be true :—

1 स्वप्नीं जें देखिलें रात्रीं, तें तें तैसेंचि होतसें
हिंडतां फिरतां गेलों, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ १ ॥
बुडाले सर्वही पापी, हिंदस्थान वळावलें
अभक्तांचा क्षयो झाला, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ २ ॥
कल्पांत मांडिला मोठा, म्लेच्छ दैत्य बुडावया
कैपक्ष घेतला देवीं, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ ३ ॥
येथून वाढला धर्म, राजधर्मासमागमें
संतोष मांडिला मोठा, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ ४ ॥
बुडाला औरंग्या पापी, म्लेच्छ संहार जाहला
मोडिलीं मांडिलीं छत्रें, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ ५ ॥
बोलणें वाउगें होतें, चालणें पाहिजे बरें
पुढें घडेल तें खरें, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ ६ ॥
उदंड जाहलें पाणी, स्नानसंध्या करावया
जपतप अनुष्ठानें, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ ७ ॥
स्मरलें लिहिलें आहे, बोलता चालता हरी
राम कर्ता राम भोक्ता, आनंदवनभूवनीं ॥ ८ ॥

---

1 " In utter darkness I dreamt: behold dreams are realized ! Hindusthan is up, has come by her own, and those that hated her and sinned against God are put down with a strong hand ! Verily it is a holy land and happy ! For, God has made her cause his own and Aurangzabe is down ! The dethroned are enthroned and the enthroned is dethroned ! Actions speak better than words ! Verily हिंदुस्थान is a holy land and happy : Now that धर्म is backed up by राजधर्म, Right by Might, the waters of Hind, no longer defiled, can enable us once more to perform our ablutions and austerities. Let come what may : Rama has made this land holy and happy !

भूषण, the Hindu poet who was one of the most prominent of our national bards that went up and down the country and roused "हिंदवान" to action and achievement in those days of the war of Hindu liberation, challenged औरंगजेब—

1 " लाज धरौ शिवजीसे लरौ सब सैयद सेख पठान पठायके ।
भूषन यां गढकोटन हारे उहां तुम क्यों मठ तोरे रिसायके ॥
हिंदुनके पति सोंन विसात सतावत हिंदु गरीबन पायके ।
लीजै कलंक न दिल्लीके बालम आलम आलमगीर कहायके ॥

*   *   *   *   *

Again at another place भूषण says—

" जगतमे जीते महावीर महाराजन ते
महाराज बावन हूं पातसाह लेवाने ।
पातसाह बावनों दिल्लीके पातशाह दिल्लीपति
पातसाह जीसो हिंदुपति सेवाने "
" दाढीके रखैयन की दाढीसी[1] रहति छाति
बाढी जस मर्याद हद्द हिंदुवानेकी
कढि गयि रयतिके मनकी कसक मिट गयी
ठसक तमाम तुरकानेकी
भूपन भनत दिल्लीपाति दिल धकधका सुनिसुनि
धाक सिवराज मरदानेकी

---

(1) " Thou art so busy in winning easy victories over the poor Hindu friars and beggars there !—Why dost thou fight so shy to face the हिंदपाति himself ? Thou hast lost fort after fort in the fair field here : that is perhaps why thou art distinguishing thyself by pulling down unoffending convents, churches, and chapels there ! Art thou not ashamed to call thyself आलमगीर—conquerer of the world, when thyself standest vanquished by the Hindu Emperor Shivaji ?

१ जलीसी.

मोठी भयि चंडी बिन चोटीके चवाय सीस
खोटी भयि संपति चकताके[1] घरानेकी ॥ "

Speaking of things that Shivaji achieved भूषण says—

राखी हिंदुवानी, हिंदुवानके तिलक राख्यो,
स्मृति और पुराण राख्यो, वेद विधी सुनि मै
राखी रजपूती राजधानी राखी राजनकी,
धरामें धरम राख्यो राख्यो गुण गुणीमे
भूषण सुकविजीति हद्द मरहट्टनकी, देसदेस
कारिति बखानि तव सुनि मैं
साहिके सुपूत सिवराज समसेर तेरी, दिल्लीदल
दाविके, दिवाल[2] राखि दुनिमै. ॥

It was in this light that achievenents of Shivaji and his compatriots were viewed by his race through out Hindusthan. भूषण though not a मराठा, felt as much proud of the victorious march of the Maratha warriors from Shivaji to Bajirao (vide भुपणग्रंथावली) as they themselves did. He was a Hindu of Hindus and till the last day of his life he kept on singing his stirring songs, emphasizing the national and Pan–Hindu aspect of the movement and impressing it on the minds of its great leaders. Amongst these छत्रसाल, the brave Bundela king, was his second favourite:—

" हैवर[3] हरट्ट[4] साजि, गैवर[5], गरट्ट[6] समपैदर थट्ट
फौज तुरकानकी
भुषण भनत रायचंपतिको छत्रसाल रोप्यो रनख्याल
व्हैके ढाल हिंदवानेकी"

Nor was this tribute paid to छत्रसाल undeserved. छत्रसाल was

---

१ बाबरके घराणेकी. २ देवालय. ३ अश्व ४ हृष्टपुष्ट ५ गजवर ६ संघ

truly like शिवाजी, राजसिंह, गुरुगोविंदसिंह–the "ढाल हिंदवानेकी". He looked upon himself as the champion of "हिंदुत्व." Says छत्रसालः–

हिंदु तुरक दीन द्वै गाये । तिनसों वैर सदा चलि आये ॥
लेख्यो सुर असुरनको जैसो । केहरि करिन वखानो तैसो ॥
जवते शहा तखतपर वैठे । तव तै हिंदुन सौं उर डाठे ॥
सहगेकर तीरथनि लगाये । वेद देवाले निदर ढहाये ॥
सव रजपूत सीर नित नावै । ऐंड करे नित पैदल धावे ॥
ऐंड एक शिवराज निबाही । करै आपके चित्ताकि चाही ॥
आठ पातसाही झुक झोरै । सूवनि वांधि डांड लै छोरै ॥

After the historical visit paid by छत्रसाल to शिवाजी the great Bundela leader, greatly encouraged by the latter "तुम छत्री सिरताज । जीत आपनी भूमिकौ करौ देशको राज ॥"—met सुजानसिंह who was a powerful Rajput chief in Bundelkhand. In the conversation that followed सुजानसिंह draws a moving picture of the political situation of the country—

"पातसाह लागे करन, हिंदुधर्म कौनासु
सुधि करि चंपतरायकी, लइ बुंदेला सासु
जब तै चंपति करयौ पयानौ, तबतै परयौ हीन हिंदवानो.
लग्यो होग तुरकजको जोरा, को राखे हिंदुनको तोरा
अव जो तुम कटि कसौ कृपानी, तौ फिरि चढे हिंदुमुख पानी"

सुजानसिंह, the old Raja saying thus offered his sword and heart to छत्रसाल and blessed him and his mission :—

यह कहि प्रीति हिये उमगाई । दिये पान किरवान बधाई
दोऊ हाथ माथपर राखे । पूरन करौ काज अभिलाखे
हिंदुधरम जग जाइ चलावौ । दौरि दिलींदल हलनि हलावौ

(छत्रप्रकाश) १

(१) छत्रप्रकाश the historical work that describes the events of छत्रसाल's reign, was composed under his direct orders by लालकवि.

तेगवहादुर, the Great Guru who not only championed the cause of this War of Hindu Liberation in Punjab but laid down his life for it, is reported to have advised the Brahmins of Kashmere who, oppressed and threatened with " Islam or death", solicited his help :—

१ तुम सुनो द्विजेसु ढिग तुर्केसु अवैसु इमगावो
इक पीर हमारा हिंदु भारा भाईचारा लख पावो
है तेगवहादुर जगत उजागर ता आगर तुर्क करो
तिसपाछे तवही हम फिर सबही बन है तुरक भरो

(पंथप्रकाश)

And when he was challenged by the foes of the race and religion he boldly answered :—

२ " तिन ते सुन श्री तेगवहादुर । धर्म निवाहन विषे वहादुर
उत्तर भनयो धर्म हम हिंदु । अति प्रियको किमकरे निकंदु "

(सूर्यप्रकाश)

His illustrious son गुरु गोविंदसिंग at once the poet, the prophet, and the warrior of our Hindu race and our Hindu culture exclaims in a moment of inspiration—

३ " सकल जगतमे खालसा पंथ गाजे

---

1. Oh Brahmins! Listen. You go and tell the Turks (Mohamedans) without fear " there is a great Hindu leader of ours, with lacs of followers. His name is Tej Bahadur—Uplifter and Awakener of mankind.—First make him embrace Islam and then we will all do the same.

2. " Hearing them, the Guru Teg Bahadur, the hero and the champion of धर्म, made reply " How can I disgrace the Hindu Dharma——so dear to my heart! "

3 " May this Khalsa Panth flourish everywhere (so that) long may Hindu Dharm live and all falsehood vanish!!

जगे धर्म हिंदु सकल भंड भाजे ॥

(विचित्र नाटक by गुरु गोविंदसिंह)

The chronicler of Shivaji in the old work "शिवछत्रपतीचें चरित्र" says:—[1]शिवाजीचे मनांत आलें जे आपण हिंदु. सर्व दक्षिण देश यवनांनीं पादाक्रांत केला. क्षेत्रास पीडा केली. हिंदुधर्म बुडविला. प्राणही देऊन धर्म रक्षूं. आपले पराक्रमें नवीन दौलत संपादूं. तें अन्न भक्षूं.

But the shrewd and trusted Dadaji advised—[2] "आपण म्हणतां तें कार्य चांगलें खरें, पण याचा शेवट लागणें परम दुष्कर. यास मातवर स्थलें असावीं. हिंदु राजे व हिंदु फौजा जागजागीं साह्यकर्त्या असाव्या. ईश्वराचें अनुकूल व सिद्ध पुरुषांचा आशिर्वाद असतां अशा गोष्टी घडतील."

(चिटणीस बखर.)

And yet Dadaji was the guiding hand of the whole movement. The youthful शिवाजी writes in 1646 A. D. to one of his young compatriots :—[3] "शहास तुम्ही आपली बेमानगिरी क-

---

1. "Shivaji" thought to himself—"We are Hindus. The Mahamedans have subjugated the entire Deccan. They have defiled our sacred places! In fact they have desecrated our religion. We will therefore protect our religion and for that we would even lose our lives. We will acquire new kingdoms by our prowess and that bread we will eat."

2. "Your plans are certainly very good; but it would be exceedingly difficult to carry them to a finish. In the first place you are to establish powerful centres. Hindu Kings and Hindu armies must afford assistance from place to place. Again God Almighty must be on our side and we must be blessed with the benedictions of consumate saints. And then these things are possible."

3 "You would not be faithless to the Emperor. Our primordeal family God is self-existing (and therefore all powerful). He has given success to our efforts so long and in future also will fulfil the object of my life by bringing about the establishment of हिंदवीस्वराज्य (Hindu Independence). Indeed it is the cherished wish of God that such a kingdom should be established."

रीत नाहीं. आदि कुलदेव स्वयंभू. त्यांनीं आम्हास यश दिलें व पुढें तो मनोरथ हिन्दवी स्वराज्य करून पुरविणार आहे. हें राज्य व्हावें हें श्रींचे मनांत फार आहे. "

Mr. Rajwade has the original copy of this letter which reveals, as it were, the soul of the great Hindu movement in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was no parochial movement–it was हिंदवी स्वराज्य–the Hindu Empire–that was the great ideal which had fired the imagination and goaded the actions of Shivaji while he was but within his teens. We have his own word for it.

But when Jaysing–a Rajput prince came to subdue Shivaji and his movement, the edge of Shivaji's power of resistence became very naturally blunted. It was disheartening in the extreme to find the Rajputs—the ancient shield of हिंदुत्व—shedding their blood and the blood of their coreligionists and brother Hindus that the Mohamedans may win! Says Shivaji to Jaysingh—[1]"तुम्हास जे किल्ले पाहिजेत ते मी देतों. निशाण चढवितों. पण मुसलमानांस यश न देणें. मी हिंदू. आपण रजपूत तेव्हां हिंदूच. राज्य मूळचें हिंदूचें. हिंदुधर्मरक्षकापुढें मी डोकें शतदा नमवीन. पण हिंदुधर्माची मानहानी होईल असें कधींही घडणार नाहीं!! "

---

1. "I am ready to hand over to you all fortresses you might ask for. I myself will plant your flag on them. But let not these Mohamadans triumph. I am a Hindu; you are a Rajput and therefore a Hindu. The kingdom has originally been of the Hindus. I will humble my head a hundred times before one who protects the Hindu religion. But I will never agree to do anything that is calculated to impair the honour of the Hindu religion."

Jaysingh was doubtless touched and replied–[1]"'औरंगजेब बादशाह पृथ्वीपति. त्यांशीं तुम्हीं सख्य करावें. शत्रुत्वानें राहून या कालीं परिणाम लागणार नाहीं. आम्ही हिंदू जयपूरचे राजे. तुम्ही हिंदूच. तुम्ही हिंदुधर्म स्थापन करतां यास्तव आम्ही तुम्हास अनुकुल आहों."

The rise of Hindu power under Shivaji had electrified the Hindu mind all over India. The oppressed looked upon him as an Avatar and a Savior. Thus we find that the people of the Savnoor District groaning under the Mohamedan yoke appeal to him [2]" हा युसुफ फार खस्त आहे. बायकापोरांस उपद्रव देणें. जुलूम गोवधादि निंद्य कर्में आम्ही त्याचे हाताखालीं वागण्यास कंटाळलों. तुम्हीं हिंदुधर्मांचें संस्थापक. म्लेच्छाचे नाशक. म्हणून तुम्हाकडे आलों. तुम्हाकडे आम्ही आलों म्हणून आमचे द्वारा चौकी बसली आहे. अन्नपाण्यावाचून जीव घेण्यास उद्युक्त झाले आहेत. तरी रात्रीचा दिवस करून येणें."

Again after Shivaji had restored the Jahagir to his brother व्यंकोजी at Tanjore on the condition that he should cease to recognize the sovereignty of the Mohamedan sway, Shivaji

---

1. Emperor Aurangazeb is a very powerful sovereign. You should therefore agree to make terms with him. You will be able to live in peace by maintaining hostile relations with him. We, Princes or Jaipur, are Hindus; you are also a Hindu. We are in accord with you since you are out to rehabilitate Hindu religion.

2. This Yusuf is a very wicked fellow. He oppresses the women and the children, commits atrocities and even resorts to such reprehensible misdeeds as the massacre of cows! We are so disgusted that we can no longer live under him. You are the restorer of the Hindu religion and the destroyer of the Mlechhas (foreigners). It is therefore that we have come to you for refuge. And since we have so approached guards have been stationed at our gates. In fact they are intent on starving us here without food and water. So do come with all haste (lit. by turning nights in-to days.)

writes :— [1] " दुष्ट हिंदुविद्वेषी यांस आपले राज्यांत ठेवूं नये. "

Rajaram, in order to express his sense of appreciation of the national services of संताजी and his brothers in the war of independence, conferred on बहीरजी the high and proud appelation "हिंदुराव". When the siege at Jinji was pressing the Maratha forces, to try their best to break through it an attempt was made to win over the Marathas in the services of the Mogul commander :—[2]" नागोजी राजे यांजकडे संधान केलें, तुम्ही आम्ही एक झाल्यास ही फौज मोडून हिंदुधर्म जतन करूं. त्यापक्षीं तुम्ही फुटून आम्हांकडे यावें". तेव्हां नागोजीराजे मुसलमानी नोकरी सोडून, मोर्चे उठवून, शहरांत ५००० फौजेनिशीं गेले...........शिर्के हे मोगलांचे तावेदार बनले (कारण त्यांचें संभाजीनें शिरकाण केलें). तेव्हां खंडोबल्लाळ म्हणाले " तुमचें शिरकाण केलें. तसेंच आमचेही तीन पुरुष हत्तीपायीं

---

1. Those who are bitter haters of Hindus should have no footing in your territory.

2. " Secret negotiations were opened with Nagoji Raje to the effect that if he joins with the Marathas they would break the enemy's forces and preserve the Hindu religion. He should therefore come over to them." Thereupon Nagoji Raje gave up service under the Mohamadans and withdrawing the attack entered the city with his battalion numbering five thousands.....When Shirke entered the service of the Moguls (as Sambhaji had beheaded the Shirka family) Khandoji Ballal said, " Shirkes had been beheaded; but similarly three of my ancestors were killed by being trampled under the foot of an elephant. But we are striving for the establishment of the kingdom of the Hindus and you must be our partners." Then, Shirke also entered the plot and helped the Marathas with the result that Rajaram broke through the siege and escaped.

मारविले. परंतु हिंदुच्या दौलतीकरितां आम्ही झटत आहोंत. तुम्ही तों भागी-आहां." तेव्हां शिर्के पण कारस्थानांत आले. व मराठ्यांस मिळून जिंजीहून राजाराम शत्रूच्या वेढ्यास तोडून सुटून गेले.

शाहू had once entered into a controversy with जयसिंग (सवाई) on the point हिंदुधर्मांचे रक्षणासाठीं मी काय व तूं काय केलेंस!" (सरदेसाई-मध्यविभाग.)

The same spirit animated the generations of Bajirao and Nanasaheb. Says the historian [1]"पुष्कळांनीं बाजीरावाच्याच उद्योगाचें अनुकरण व परिपोष केलेला दिसतो....ब्रह्मेंद्रस्वामी, गोविंद दीक्षित वगैरे देशभर यात्रा करून अनुभव घेतलेल्या साधुपुरुषांच्या ठिकाणीं वरील 'हिन्दुपदपादशाहीची' भावना स्फुरण पावत होती व ते आपल्या सर्व शिष्यवर्गास याच भावनेनें उपदेशित होते." (सरदेसाई). बाजीराव स्वतः म्हणतातः—"अरे बघतां काय ? चला जोरानें चाल करून. हिन्दुपद-पादशाहीस आतां उशीर काय ?" (बाजीराव).

Brahmendra Swami was the central figure of the intellectuals of that period. [2]"परंतु हिंदुधर्माचा उच्छेद ज्या राज्यांत होतो

---

1. It appears that others also followed or supplemented Bajirao in the great work undertaken by him...........The above idea of हिंदुपदपादशाही (Hindu Sovereignty) was animating the hearts of such saints as Brahmendra Swami, Govind Dixit and others who had been going over the country on pilgrimages and acquiring experience. They were imparting instructions to their disciples with the same idea (Sardesai). Bajirao himself says, " Why do you tarry ? Rush vigorously and attack; and हिंदुपदपादशाही (Hindu Kingdom) is at hand !" (Bajirao).

2. But the Swami did not think it proper to meet one in whose territory Hindu Religion was being defiled !........He impressed upon Shahu's mind how disgraceful it was that Dities and Brahmins should be subjected to atrocities in the territory of a Hindu !" (Sardesai).

त्यास भेटणें स्वामीस योग्य वाटलें नाहीं!........हिंदूंच्या साम्राज्यांत देवाब्राम्हणांचा छळ होणें ही गोष्ट किती लज्जास्पद आहे ही गोष्ट त्यानें शाहूच्या मनांत भरवून दिली." (सरदेसाई.)

Mathurabai writes to the Swami:—[1]"शंकराजी मोहिते, गणोजी शिंदे, खंडोजी नाळकर, रामाजी खराडे, कृष्णाजी मोड इत्यादि मातवर सरदारांनीं राज्य रक्षण करून शामलांचा मोड केला व कोकणांत हिंदुधर्म राखला!" The letters sent by this brave lady, Mathurabai Angre, are all so full with patriotic fervour and force that they deserve a perusal from all those who want to catch the real spirit of the great Hindu revival.

The Portuguese fanaticism at Goa was an Indian edition of the Inquisition in Europe. Once they prohibited the open observation of all Hindu religious rites and rituals. Then the public spirited अंताजी रघुनाथ defied the order and encouraged other Hindus to do the same. But he knew perfectly well that impotent passive resistence is impotent suffering. To be successful under such conditions as then prevailed it must be backed up by the sword of a Bajirao or a Chimanaji. It was अंताजी रघुनाथ who brought about the revolution in the Portuguese territories in India, enlisted the sympathies of all Hindu leaders on the side of Bajirao and in fact was the prime mover who brought about the Maratha invasion which ended in the liberations of almost all the Hindu territories after the triumphant campaign of Chimanaji Appa.

---

1. Shankraji Mohite, Ranoji Sinde, Khandoji Nalkar, Ramaji Kharade, Krishnaji Mod and other powerful sardars have preserved the kingdom, exterminated the Mohamadans and protected the Hindu religion in Konkan.

But in the meanwhile and before the fall of वसई, Nadirshah invaded India and Delhi had fallen in his hands. The Maratha agents of Bajirao write to him :—[1] "तह्मास्पकुलीखान कांहीं देव नाहीं जे पृथ्वी कापून काढील. जवरदस्ताशीं सुलुख करील. म्हणून मातवर फौजेनिशीं यावें. आधीं जवरदस्ती व मग सुलुख. आतां सारे रजपूत व स्वामी (बाजीराव) एकजागा झालिया निकाल पडेल. समस्तांस (हिंदूंस) बुंदेले वगैरे एक जागा करून मोठा भाव दाखविला पाहिजे. नादिरशहा माघारा जात नाहीं. हिंदुराज्यावरी निघेल...रायांचे (सवाई जयसिंग) मनीं राणाजीस तख्तावर बसवावें असें आहे. हिन्दुराजे सवाई आदिकरून स्वामींचे स्वारीची मार्गप्रतीक्षा करतात. स्वामींचें पुष्टिवल होतांच जाट वगैरे फौज दिल्लीवरी पाठवून सवाईजी आपण दिल्लीस जाणार." (धोंडो गोविंद's letters to Bajirao.)

But as वसई was still holding out Bajirao could not go in time. He was chafing under his inabilities. He writes [2]" हिंदुलोकांस संकट थोर प्राप्त झालें आहे. अद्याप वसई आली नाहीं....

---

1. Tahmaspkulikhan (Nadirshah) is not a devine being so as to be able to destroy the whole creation. He is bound to come to terms with those that prove strong. Therefore Your Excellency (Bajirao) should come with a strong force. *Peace can come only after a war. We can expect a decisive result if your Excellency and the entire Rajput chiefs combine now.* We must join together all the Hindus including Bundele and such others and we must present a more than brilliant front. Nadirshah does not intend to go back . He will directly march on the Hindu Kingdom......Savai Jaysing wants that Ranaji (of Udepur) should be installed on the imperial throne. *The Hindu Kings including Savai* are looking for the arrival of Your Excellency. In fact as soon as Your Excellency can give a strong backing Savaiji will send forces against Delhi and will also himself march. (Dhondo Govind's letters to Bajirao).

2. The Hindus are placed in a critical situation. We have not yet captured Bassein.....Under the circumstances all the Maratha armies should combine and cross river Chameli.the The plan is that the (Nadir)

ऐशास तमाम मराठी फौजा एक होऊन चमेलीपार व्हावें. त्यास (नादिरास) अलीकडे येऊं देऊं नये असा विचार आहे. (बाजीराव to ब्रह्मेंद्रस्वामी).

But his indomitable spirit rose triumphant over all obstacles. He writes again :—[1]" आपलीं घरगुतीं भांडणें (रघुजींचें पारिपत्य वगैरे) बाजूला ठेवलीं पाहिजेत. **आतां सर्व हिन्दुस्थानास एक शत्रु उत्पन्न झाला आहे.** मी तर नर्मदा उतरून सर्व मराठी सैन्य चंबळे पर्यंत पसरून देणार. मग पाहूं या नादिरशहा कसा खालीं येतो तो ! (बाजीराव's letters.)

सवाई जयसिंग was as intensely proud of his हिंदुत्व as any one else of the great leaders of the Hindu movement. It was he who directed the people—the oppressed Hindus–in Malva to request Bajirao to extend the war of Hindu liberation to Malva and thus to take a further important step towards the realization of the mission of generations of the followers of the Shivaji cult all over India—the mission of हिंदुपद पादशाही. In one of his letters the enlightened and patriotic Rajput prince writes :—[2]" सिधिश्री.............. नंदलालजी प्रधान व भाइजी

Contd. Footnote page 55

should not be allowed to proceed further. (Bajirao to Brahmendra Swami).

1. We must lay aside our internal differences (such as punishment of Raghoji and others). *The whole of Hindustan has now one common enemy* to encounter. As for myself I have decided to cross the Narbada and spread the Maratha armies as far as Chambal ; and we shall see how Nadirshah proceeds southwards (Bajirao's letter).

2. May you get success and wealth !....Respectful greetings to Nandlalji Pradhan and Bhaiji Thakur Sansthan Indore from Maharajadhiraj Jaisang, camp Amargad. You are informed that the the Emperor has started operations. But you need not be anxious. God Almighty will bring the matters to a successful issue. We have seured from Bajirao Peshve solemn promises concerning you.

ठाकूर संस्थान इंदोर अमरगढसु महाराजाधिराज श्री सवाई जयसिंगजी कृत प्रमाण वंचजो............सो आपको लिखते है कि बादशहानें चढाई की है, तो कुछ चिंता नहीं. श्री परमात्मा पार लगावेगा. बाजीराव पेशवेसे हमने आपके निसवत कोलवचन कर लिया है." Again he writes :—[1]"हजार शाबास है आप सब मालवे सरदार एक रहके हिंदुधर्मका कल्याण होना और मालवेमें हिंदुधर्मकी वृद्धी होना. इस बात विचार कर मालवेमेसे मुसलमानोंको नौमेद किये. और हिंदुधर्म कायम रखा." (Jayasing's letters 26-10-1721 A.D.)

Nana Saheb the son of Bajirao was in fact the greatest leader of men that the Great Movement of Hindu liberation and हिंदुपदपादशाही brought to the front. His correspondence is a study by itself. Wherever we find him we find him the champion of हिंदुत्व. To Tarabai he writes :—[2]"मोगल केवळ हिंदु राज्याचे शत्रु. त्यांस देखील अनुसंधानें होत असतां सेवकच वांकडे वर्ततात हा दोष!" (Nanasaheb's letters).

Though much was lost on the field of Panipat yet all was not lost. For, two men survived the battle and saved the cause. Nana Farnavis and Mahadaji Shinde—the brain, the sword, the shield of the Hindu Power—thought and worked and fought for 50 years or so—in spite of the disastrous defeat of Panipat or rather in virtue of it—for, that defeat was the greatest blow that the Victors had ever received—and suc-

1. Oh splendid! Really creditable. It is meet and proper that you and the other chiefs of Malva should unite and bring about the prosperity and growth of the Hindu religion. It was with this object that the Musalmans were discouraged from Malva and the Hindu religion was preserved in tact.

2. The Mogul (Nizam) is an inveterate enemy of the Hindu power, and yet, while you are yourself carrying on negotiations with them you accuse (me)your humble servant of crooked ways (Nana Saheb's letters)

ceeded in making the Hindus the *de facto* Rulers of Hindusthan. How conscious the national mind had grown of the triumphant turn events had taken, and how intensely proud had they been of हिंदुत्व and the Hindu Empire all but established, can best be seen in the letters of the most talented deplomatic writers of that period. Govindrao Kale writes to Nana Farnavis from the capital of the Nizams on learning the news that gladdened the Marathas from end to end of Maharashtra that the misunderstanding growing between the two men Nana and Mahadaji had disappeared :—

[1]" पत्र पाहतांच रोमांच उभे राहिले. अति संतोष झाला. विस्तार पत्रीं किती लिहूं? ग्रंथचे ग्रंथचे मनांत आले. **अटक नदीचे अलिकडे दाक्षिण समुद्रापावेतों हिन्दुचें स्थान—तुरकस्थान नव्हे. हे आपली सिमा पांडवापासून विक्रमाजितपावेतो.** त्यांनीं राखून उपभोभ घेतला. त्यां मागें राज्यकर्ते नादान निघाले. यवनांचें प्रावल्य झालें. चकत्यांनीं (बावरच्या वंशजांनीं) हस्तनापुरचें राज्य घेतलें. शेंवटीं अलमगिराचे कारकीर्दीत यज्ञोपवीतास साडेतीन रुपये जेजया वसून ओलें अन्न विकत घ्यावें अशी नौवत गुजरली.

---

1. When I read your letter I was simply thrilled with joy. Indeed I felt mightily happy. I cannot express all that fully in a letter. Literally my mind was flooded with thoughts. All the territory *from the river Atak to the Indian Ocean is the land of the Hindus—and not of the Turks. These have been our frontiers from the times of Pandavas down to those* of *Vikramaditya.* They preserved it and enjoyed. After them the rulers turned out to be quite effete and the Yavanas (Mohamadans) rose in power. The Moguls seized the Kingdom of Hastinapur. And eventually during the regime of Alamgir we were reduced to such straits that wearer of every Yadnyopavita (the sacred thread) was required to pay a jijeya tax of Rs. 3-8 and to buy cooked food.

त्या दिवसांत कैलासवासी शिवाजी महाराज शककर्ते व धर्मराखते निघाले. त्यांनीं किंचित् कोन्यांत धर्मरक्षण केलें. **पुढें कैलासवासी नानासाहेब व भाऊसाहेब प्रचंड प्रतापसूर्य असे झाले कीं असे कधीं झाले नाहीं.** हल्लीं श्रीमंताचे पुण्यप्रतापें करून व राजेश्री पाटील बुवांच्या बुद्धि व तरवारीच्या पराक्रमेंकरून सर्व घरास आलें. परंतु झालें कसें? **प्राप्त झालें तेणेंकरून सुलभता वाटली.** अगर मुसलमान कोणी असते तरी मोठे मोठे तवारिखनामे झाले असते. यवनांच्या जार्तीत इतकी गोष्ट चांगली झाल्यास गगनावरोबर करून शोभवावी. आमचे हिंदूंत गगनाइतकी झाली असतां उच्चार न करावा हे चाल आहे. अलभ्य गोष्टी घडल्या. यवनांच्या मनांत कीं काफरशाही झाली असें बोलतात.

लेकिन ज्यांनीं ज्यांनीं हिंदुस्थानांत शिरें उचललीं त्यांचीं पाटील बावांनीं फोडलीं. न लाभल्या त्या गोष्टी लाभल्या. त्यांचा बंदोबस्त शककर्त्याप्रमाणें होऊन उपभोग घ्यावें पुढेंच आहे. कोठें पुण्याईत उणें पडेल आणि काय दृष्ट

Contd, Footnote page 58

At such a juncture was born Shivaji Maharaj, the founder of the era and the protector of the religion. However his mission was confined to a limited area. *Then came Nanasaheb and Bhausaheb of respected memory—Heroes of such pre-eminent prowess that the like of them has not been born.* And now everything has been restored to us under the benigh and illustrious auspices of Shrimant (Peshve) owing to the astuteness and valour of Patil Boa. But how was all this achieved. *Because we had won we thought it had been an easy matter.* If it had been the case of Mohamadans volumes of histories would have been written about it. Amongst the Mohamadans even the smallest matter is extolled by them to the skies. While amongst us Hindus we are inclined not even to refer to our exploits however magnificient they may be. Indeed results difficult to achieve have been achieved. The Mohamadans think and say that the accursed Hindus have established their supremacy!

लागेल नकळे. झाल्या गोष्टी यांत केवळ मुलुख, राज्य प्राप्त इतकेंच नाहीं तरी वेदशास्त्ररक्षण, गोब्राम्हणप्रतिपालन, सार्वभौमत्व हातीं लागणें, कीर्तीयश यांचे नगारे वाजणें इतक्या गोष्टी आहेत. हे किमया संभाळणें हक्क आपला व पाटील बावांचा. त्यांत वेत्यास पडला कीं दोस्त दुष्मन् मजबूत. संशय दूर झाला. अति चांगलें. अति चांगलें. दुष्मन् उशापायथ्याशीं लागून आहेत. चैन नव्हतें. आपण लिहिल्यावरून मन स्वस्थ झालें. (इ. स. १७९३)

This one single letter penned with such ease and grace gives a truer expression to the spirit of our History than many a dull volumes had done. How spontaneously it hits on the right derivation of the epithets हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान and how completely our anscestors down to the last generation loved and reverenced and identified themselves with these epithets is so eloquently illustrated in this letter as to render it superfluous to cite any more.

Concl'd. Footnote page 58

And really Patil Boa has broken the heads of those who tried to raise them. In fact the unachievable has been achieved. To establish order and reap its benefit like the great kings is still ahead. I am afraid where our merits will fail and the work will be spoiled. The *achievements are not limited to the acquisition of territory and regaining of our Kingdom but include the preservation of Vedas and Shastras, rehabilitation of religion, protection of cows and Brahmins, establishment of Suzerainty and the diffusion of our fame and victory.* To keep all this in tact depends on you and Patil Boa. If there is difference amongst you the enemy is bound to grow strong. Now my misgivings are at rest. It was really splendid! Very excellent! The enemies are beseting us on all sides. I was very uneasy. Your letter has been a relief to me (1793 A.D.)

V

Having thus tried to trace the successive chapters of the history of the words हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान from the earliest Vedic period to the fall of the last of our Hindu empire in 1818 A.D., we are now in a position to address ourselves to the main task of determining the essentials of हिंदुत्व. The first result of our enquiry is to explode the baseless suspicion which has crept into the minds of some of our well-meaning but hasty country-men that, the origin of the words हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान is to be traced to the malice of the Mohamedans! After all that has been said in the previous section about the history of these words, this suspicion seems so singularly stupid that to mention it is to refute it. Long before Mohmad was born, nay, long before the Arabians were heard of as a people, this ancient nation was known to ourselves as well as to the foreign world by the proud epithet सिंधु or हिंदु and Arabians could not have invented this term any more than they could have invented the Indus itself. They simply learnt it from the ancient Iranians, Jews, and other peoples. But apart from all serious historical refutation, is it not clear that had it been really contempuous expression of our foes as it is said to be, could it have ever recommended itself to the bravest and best of our race? Surely our people were not quite such stangers either to the Arabic or Persian tongues! The Mohamedans were apt to refer to us as काफीर also, but had our people adopted that name and stuck it up as a distinguishing mark? Why did they submit voluntarily to the

national insult only in the case of the other epithets हिंदुस्थान or हिंदु? Simply because, they knew more of our national traditions and were less cut-off from our national life than some of us had been. That is why some of us keep constantly harping on the fact that this word हिंदु is not found in sanskrit. What of this word alone?—The sanskrit literature makes no mention of किशन-बनारस-मराठा-शिख-गुजराथ-पाटणा-सिया-जमना and thousand other words that we use daily. But are they to be traced to some foreign source? The word बनारस though not found in संस्कृत is still ours because it is the प्राकृत form of वाराणसी which is found in संस्कृत. In fact it is ridiculous to expect a प्राकृत word in classical संस्कृत. Nay more: although हिंदु being a प्राकृत form of a संस्कृत word should not be expected to be found in संस्कृत yet as it is, it cannot be but a weighty proof of its importance even in its प्राकृत form that, that form should be, at times, met with in संस्कृत literature: for example the मेरुतंत्र uses this word हिंदु. Great Sanskrit lexicographers like आपटे in Maharashtra and तारानाथ तर्कवाचस्पति in Bengal have also mentioned it. While the line शिवशिव न हिंदुर्न यवनः is too well-known to be quoted.

It may be that in the modern Mohamedanised Persian some contemptuous meaning has come to be associated with the term हिंदु but how does that show that the original signification of हिंदु was contemptuous and meant "black"? The words हिंदी or हिंद are used in Persian but they do not mean black and yet we know that they along with हिंदु are originated from the same sanskrit word सिंधु or सिंध. If

the word हिंदु is applied to us because it means 'black' then is it that हिंद and हिंदी are also applied to us though they do not mean "a black man"? The fact is that the word हिंदु dates its origin not from the Mohamedanised Persian but from the ancient language of Iran, the Zend, and then the हप्तहिंदु meant सप्तसिंधु alone. It *could not* have been applied to us because we were black *literally*, for the simple reason that the ancient सप्तसिंधुs i.e. हिंदूs in Avestic period—were as fair as the Iranians and lived practically side by side and even at times together with them. Even so late as at the dawn of the Christian era the Parthians used to call our frontier provinces as श्वेतभारत or white Inida. Thus originally हिंदु simply could not have literally meant a black man.

In fact, after it has been made so amply clear in the foregoing sections that the epithets हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान had been the proud and patriotic designations signifying our land and our nation long before the Mohamedans or Mohamedanised Persians were heard of, it becomes almost immaterial, so far as the greatness of the epithet Hindu and its claim to our love are concerned, what meaning, complimentary or contemptuous, is attached to it by some swollen-headed fanatic here and there. There was a time when the term "England" had fallen so low in England itself in the estimation of her Norman conquerers that it became a formula of swearing against each other! "May I become an Englishman !" was the strongest form of self denunciation and calling a Norman "an Englishman" an unpardonable insult. But did the English care to change the name of their land or their

nation and call it Normandy instead of England ? Or would their disowning their name as "the English" have made them great ? No; on the contrary, precisely because they did not disown their ancient blood or name, to-day we find that while the word Norman has become an historical fossil and Normandy has no place on the map of the world the contemptuous English and their English language have come to own the largest empire the world has as yet seen ! And yet great as the glories of the English world are, what on the whole, has it to show to match the glories of the Hindu world ?

In times of conflict nations do loose their balance of mind and if the Persians or others once understood by the word हिंदु a thief or a black man alone, then let them remember that the word Mohamedan too was not always mentioned to denote any very enviable type of man-kind by the Hindus either. To call a man Musalman or better still a 'Musunda' was worse than calling him a brute. Such bitter fulminations and mutual recriminations, though they might have the excuse of inevitability in times of life-and-death struggles while the fume and flame of the angry brutal passions last, should be forgotten as soon as men recover from their fits and claim to be recognised as gentlemen. Nor should we forget that the ancient Jews used the term हिंदु to denote strength or vigour for, these were the qualities associated with our land and nation. In an Arab epic named "So hab Mo Alakk" it is said that the oppressions of kith and kin are bitterer or more fatal than the stroke of a Hindu sword ; while "Returning a Hindu answer" is a proverbial way with the Persians

themselves, by which they are said to mean 'to strike bravely and deeply with an Indian sword'. The ancient Babylonians had been in the habit of denoting the finest quality of cloth as 'सिंधु' because it generally came from the सप्तसिंधुs—a custom which also shows that they also knew our country by its ancient name सिंधु; nor have we as yet heard of any other meaning being attributed to this word in the ancient Babylonian language than its national one.

No Hindu can help feeling proud of himself at the curious interpretation put upon this epithet by the illustrious traveller Yuan Chwang, himself belonging to our highly civilized and ancient neighbours the Chinese, when he identifies our national name "हिंदु" with the sanskrit "इंदु" and says in justification that the world had rightly called this nation "इंदुs" for they and their civilization had, like the moon, ever been a constant source of delight and refreshment to the languid and weary soul of man. Does not all this clearly show that the way of inspring respect for our name in the minds of men is not either to change or deny it but to compel recognition of, and homage to, it by the valour of our arms, purity of our aims and the sublimity of our souls. Even if we allow some of our brethren to ride their hobby horse in all glee and get themselves recognised and registered in the census reports as "Aryans" instead of as Hindus yet they could only succeed in dragging down the word Aryan to their own level and adding one more synonym to the vocabulary of the words for a 'helot' and a 'cooly'—as long as our nation does not attain to

the heights of greatness and of strength as in the days of yore.

But apart from any serious arguments against the absurd proposal of denying the epithets Hindu or Hinduism, and granting for a while the stupid theory that their origin is to be traced to the malice of foreigners,—we simply ask, is it possible to deny them and coin a new word for our national designation? As it stands at present the word Hindu has come to be the very banner of our race and the one great feature that above all others contributes to strengthen and uphold our racial unity from Cape to Kashmere, from Attak to Kattak. Do you think you can change it as easily as a cap? Once it happened that a gentleman, well-meaning and patriotic, intended to get himself registered in the Census records as an Aryan instead of a Hindu, as he had been a victim to the wide-spread lie that we were first called Hindus by the Persian Mohamedans out of their contempt—that the word meant a thief or a black man. Yet I could not enter into any detailed discussion about the origin of the word for want of time and so simply questioned him as to what his own name was. He told it was "तक्सिंग." "My good friend," I continued, "unlike the word Hindu whose origin is at the worst disputable, your name is indisputably a hybrid word and should therefore be first replaced in the register by some ancient and purely Aryan word—say मौद्गलायन or सिंहासनसिंह. Having evaded the point for a while he tried to point out how difficult it was to do so and how it would completely upset his economical position and after all how could he get

the world to call him by the new fangled name or what could be gained at all by this risky experiment of calling himself "सिंहासनासिंह" while all others persisted in calling him "तक्तासिंग". "But" I rejoined, " if to change your individual name, which is indisputably foreign, seems to you so difficult, nay harmful, then my friend, how much more difficult would it be to change the name of a whole race which is so far from being a foreign invention that it is ours as much as Vedas are ours !—and how much more futile ? Of the futility of any such attempt to change a deep-rooted name, a far more convincing example than this personal one is furnished by our Sikh brotherhood in the Punjab. The band of the best and the bravest of the Hindu race whom our Great Guru had chosen, triumphantly exclaiming "नीलवस्त्रके कपडे फाडे तुरक पाणी अंमल गया !", for the expressed purpose of धर्म चलावन संत उवारण, दुष्ट दैत्यके मूल उपाटण, यहि काज धरा मै जनमम्। समझ लेहु साधुसम मननम्। (परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशायच दुष्कृताम्। धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय संभवामि युगे युगे)—that band of warriors was named " Khalasa "! The saintly नानक who bewailed " क्षत्रियांहि धर्म छोडिया म्लेच्छ भाषा गाहि। सृष्टि सब इकवर्ण हुई धर्मकी गति रही! " is daily greeted with a " वाह गुरुजीकी फते। वाह गुरुजीका खालसा." The words दरबार, दिवाण बहादूर, have crept like thieves to the very heart of our Harimandirs. They are the scars of our old wounds. The wounds are healed but the scars persist and seem to be incorporated with our form. As long as any attempt to scratch them out threatens to harm us more than profit, so long all that we can do is to tolerate them; for after all they are the scars of wounds received in a conflict that we have

won in a gory field in which we remained as the victors of the day.

And yet, if any words, however closely they might have been associated with things sacred, are to be disowned and changed they are these; for they all are indisputably foriegn and reminiscent of alien domination. Does it not seem almost insincere that we, who can not only tolerate but love these names, should clamour to disown the epithet हिंदु or हिंदुस्थान which is the very cradle name of our race and of our land chosen by our patriarchs, recorded in the most ancient and revered annals of the world—the Vedas?—An epithet which had proudly been borne by millions of our country-men on both sides of the सिंधु for the last forty centuries if not more; which expanded to and embraced the whole of our country from Kashmere to the Cape and from अटक to कटक; which sums up in a word the whole geographical position of our race and our land सिंधु or हिंदु; which had been recognized as the sign of distinction to mark out the "राष्ट्रमार्यस्यचोत्तमम्." An epithet for which our foes hated us and for which our warriors from शालिवाहान to शिवाजी went forth in their thousands to keep up their fight from century to century. It was this word हिंदु that was found impressed on the ashes of पद्मिनी and चितोर. It was this word हिंदु that was owned by तुलसीदास, तुकाराम, रामकृष्ण and रामदास; हिंदुपदपादशाही was the dream of रामदास, the mission of शिवाजी, the polar star of the ambitions of Bajirao and Banda Bahadur, of Chhatrasal and Nanasaheb, of Pratap and Pratapaditya. It was inscribed on the banner defending which a hundred thousand

Hindu heroes fell inflicting fatal wounds on the foes, on the battle field of Panipat—and Bhau at the head of them all and sword in hand !—within one single day ! It was for the हिंदुपदपादशाही that inspite of all that martyrdom and in virtue of it, Nana and Mahadji steered the nation clear of all rocks and shoals and brought it almost within sight of the coveted shores. It is this epithet हिंदु or हिंदुस्थान that, even to this day, owns a loving allegiance of millions of our people—from the throne of Nepal to the begging bowl in the street. To disown these words is like to cut off and cast away the very heart of our people. You would be dead before you do that. It is not only fatal but futile. To outset the words Hindu or Hindusthan from the position they hold is to try to outset the Himalayas from theirs !—Nothing but an earthquake with all its terrible wrenches and appalling uncertainties can accomplish that !

The objection that is levelled against the oppellation हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान on account of the mistaken notion which attributed their origin to foreign sources could, if left to itself, be easily laid low by advancing undesirable historical facts. But as it is, this objection is in some cases backed up by a secret fear that if the epithet be honoured and owned then all those who do so would be looked upon as believers in the dogmas and religious practices that go by the name "Hinduism". This fear, though it is not often admitted openly, that a Hindu is, necessarily and by the very fact that he is a Hindu, a believer in the so called Hinduism, makes many a man determined not to get convinced that the epithets are

not an alien invention. Nor is this fear totally unjustified. But it would be more candid if those who entertain this fear should openly advance it as the ground of their objection to being recognised as Hindus and not try to hide it under a false and untenable issue. The superficial similarity between these two terms हिंदुत्व and Hinduism is responsible for this regrettable estrangement that, at times, alienates well-meaning gentlemen in our Hindu brotherhood. The distinction between these two tems would be presently made clear. Here it is enough to point out that if there be really any word of alien growth it is this word Hinduism and so we should not allow our thoughts to get confused by this new-fangled term. That a man can be as truely Hindu as any without believing even in the Vedas as an independent religious authority is quite clear from the fact that thousands of our Jain brethren, not to mention others, are for generations calling themselves Hindus and would, even to this day, feel hurt if they be called otherwise. We refer to this simply as an actual fact apart from any detailed justification and examination of it which would presently follow. Till then, we hope, our readers would not allow prejudicial fear regarding the conclusion of our argument as to its intrinsic merit and bear in mind we have throughout the foregoing sections been dealing—not with any " ism " whatever but—with हिंदुत्व alone in its national and racial and cultural aspects.

Now we are fairly in a position to try to analyse the contents of one of the most comprehensive and bewilderingly synthetic concept known to human tongue. हिंदुत्व is a de-

rivative word from हिंदु. We have seen that the earliest and the most sacred records of our race show that the appellation सप्तसिंधु or हप्तहिंदु was applied to a region in which the Vedic nation flourished. This geographical sense being the primary one has, now contrasting now expanding, but ever persistently, been associated with the words हिंदु and हिंदुस्थान till after the lapse of nearly 5000 years if not more, हिंदुस्थान has come to mean the whole continental country from the सिंधु to सिंधु, from the Indus to the Seas. The most important factor that contributes to the cohesion, strength and the sense of unity of a people is that they should possess an internally well connected and externally well demarcated " local habitation, " and a " name " that could, by its very mention, rouse up the cherished image of their motherland as well as the loved memories of their past. We are happily blessed with both these important requisites for a strong and united nation. Our land is so vast and yet so well-knit, so well demarcated from others and yet so strongly entrenched, that no country in the world is more closely marked out by the fingers of nature as a geographical unit beyond cavil or criticism. So also is the name हिंदुस्थान or हिंदु that it has come to bear. The first image that it rouses in the mind is unmistakably of our motherland and by an express appeal to its geographical and physical features it verifies it into a living Being. हिंदुस्थान meaning the land of हिंदुs, the first essential of हिंदुत्व must necessarily be this geographical one. A Hindu is primarily a citizen either in himself or through his forefathers of "हिंदुस्थान" and claims the land as his mother-

land. In America as well as France the word Hindu is generally understood thus exactly in the sense of an Indian without any religious or cultural implication. And had the word हिंदु been left to convey this primary significance only, which it had in common with all the words derived from the सिंधु then it would really have meant only an Indian, a citizen of हिंदुस्थान, as the word हिंदी does.

But through out our inquiry we have been concerning ourselves more with what is than with what would have been or what should be. Not that to paint what should be is not a legitimate pursuit ; nay, it is as necessary and at times more stimulating ; but even that could be better done by first getting a firm hold of what actually is. We must try therefore to be on our guard so that in our attempt to determine the essentials of हिंदुत्व we be guided entirely by the actual contents of the word as it stands at present. So, although the root-meaning of the word Hindu, like the sister epithet Hindi, may mean only an Indian, yet as it is we would be straining the usage of words too much—we fear, to the point of breaking--if we call a Mahomedan a Hindu because of his a being resident of India. It may be that at some future time the word Hindu may come to indicate a citizen of Hindusthan and nothing else ; that day can only rise when all cultural and religious bigotry has disbanded its forces pledged to aggressive egoism, and religions cease to be " isms " and become merely the common fund of eternal principles that lie at the root of all, that are a common foundation on which the Human State majsetically and firmly rests. But as even the

first streaks of this consumation, so devoutly to be wished for, are scarcely discernible on the horizen, it would be folly for us to ignore stern realities. As long as every other "ism" has not disowned its special dogmas, which ever tend into dangerous war cries, so long no cultural or national unit can afford to loosen the bonds, especially those of a common name and a common banner, that are the mighty sources of organic cohesion and strength. An American may become a citizen of India. He would certainly be entitled, if *bona fide*, to be treated as our भारतीय or हिंदी, a countryman and a fellow citizen of ours. But as long as, in addition to our country, he has not adopted our culture and our history, inherited our blood and has come to look upon our land not only as the land of his love but even of his worship, he cannot get himself incorporated into the Hindu fold. For although the first requisite of हिंदुत्व is that he be a citizen of Hindusthan either by himself or through his forefathers, yet it is not the only requisite qualification of it, as the term Hindu has come to mean much more than its geographical significance.

The reason that explains why the term हिंदु cannot be synonymous with भारतीय or हिंदी and mean an Indian only, naturally introduces us to the second essential implication of that term. The Hindus are not merely the citizens of the Indian state because, they are united not only by the bonds of the love they bear to a common motherland but also by the bonds of a common blood. They are not only a राष्ट्र but also a जाति. The word जाति, derived from the root

जा to produce, means a brotherhood, a race determined by a common origin—possessing a common blood. All Hindus claim to have in their veins the blood of the mighty race incorporated with and descended from The Vedic fathers, the सिंधुs. We are well aware of the not unoften interested objection that carpingly questions " but are you really a race? Can you be said to possess a common blood?" We can only answer by questioning in return, " are the English a race? Is there any thing as English blood, the French blood, the German blood or the Chinese blood in this world? Do they, who have been freely infusing foreign blood into their race by contracting marriages with other races and peoples, possess a common blood and claim to be a race by themselves? If they do, then the Hindus also can emphatically do so. For the very castes, which you, owing to your colossal failure to understand and view them in the right perspective, assert to have barred the common flow of blood into our race, have done so more truly and more effectively as regards the foreign blood than our own. Nay, is not the very presence of these present castes a standing testimony to a common flow of blood from a ब्राह्मण to a चांडाल? Even a cursory glance at any of our स्मृतिs would conclusively prove that the अनुलोम and प्रतिलोम marriage institutions were the order of the day and have given birth to the majority of the castes that obtain amongst us. If a क्षत्रिय has a son from a शूद्र woman, he gives birth to the उग्र caste: again, if the क्षत्रिय raises an issue on an उग्रा he founds a श्वपच class. While a ब्राह्मण mother and a शूद्र father beget the caste चांडाल. From the vedic

story of सत्यकाम जाबाली to महादजी शिंदे—every page of our history shows that the ancient Ganges of our blood has come down from the altitudes of the subline vedic heights to the palins of our modern history fertilizing much, incorporating many a noble stream and purifying many a lost soul, increasing in volume and depth and richness, defying the danger of being lost in bogs and sands and flows to-day refreshed and reinvigorated more than ever. All that caste system has done is to regulate its noble flood on lines believed—and on the whole rightly believed—by our saintly and patriotic law-givers and kings to contribute most to fertilise and enrich all that was barren and poor, without famishing and debasing all that was flourishing and nobly endowed.

This is true not only in the case of those castes that are the outcome of the intermarriages between the chief four castes or between the chief four castes and the cross-born, but also in the case of those tribes or races who some-where in the dimness of the hoary past were leading a separate and self-centered life. Witness the customs prevailent in Malabar or Nepal where a Hindu of the highest caste is allowed to marry a woman of those who are supposed to be the originally alien tribes but who, even if the suggestion be true, have by their brave and loving defence of the Hindu culture have been incorporated with and bound to us by the dearest of ties—the ties of a common blood. Is the नागवंश a Dravidian family? Well then who is who now when the youths of अग्निवंश have taken to them the daughters of the नागs and the चंद्रवंश and the सूर्यवंश have bestowed their damsels on the youths of

both the families ? Down to the day of हर्ष—not to mention the partial break-down of the caste system itself in the centuries of Buddhistics way—intermarriages were the order of the day. Take for example the case of a single family of the Pandawas. The sage पराशर was a ब्राह्मण, he fell in love with the fair maid of a fisherman who gave birth to the world-renouned व्यास, who in his turn raised two sons on the क्षत्रिय princesses अंबा and अंबालिका; one of these two suns, पांडु, allowed his wives to raise issue by resorting to the नियोग system and they, having solicited the love of men of unknown castes, gave birth to the heroes of our great epic. Without mentioning equally distinguished characters of the same period कर्ण, बभ्रुवाहन, घटोत्कच, विदुर and others, we beg to point out to the relatively modern cases of चंद्रगुप्त said to have married a ब्राह्मण girl who gave birth to the father of अशोक; अशोक who had as a prince married a वैश्य maid ; हर्ष who being a वैश्य gave his daughter in marriage to a क्षत्रिय prince ; व्याधकर्मा who is said to be a son of a व्याध with whom his mother, a ब्राह्मण girl, had fallen in love and who grew to be the "यज्ञाचार्य" of विक्रमादित्य; सूरदास; कृष्णंभट्ट who being a ब्राह्मण fell so desperately in love with a चांडाल girl as to lead an open married life with her and subsequently became the founder of the religious sect "मातंगी पंथ"; who, never the less call themselves and are perfectly entitled to be recognised as Hindus. This is not all. An individual at times by his or her iron actions may loose his or her first caste and be relegated to another.—शूद्रो ब्राह्मणतामेति ब्राह्मणश्चैति शूद्रताम् । ". The injunction "न कुलं कुलमित्याहुराचारं कुलमुच्यते । आचारकुशलो राजन् इह

चामुत्र नंदते ॥ उपासते येन पूर्वां द्विजा संध्यां न पश्चिमां । सर्वांस्तान् धार्मिको राजा शूद्रकर्मणि योजयेत् ॥"—was not always an empty threat. Many a क्षत्रिय have by taking to agriculture and other occupations of life lost the respect due to a क्षत्रिय and were classed with some of the other castes; while many a brave man, in cases whole tribes, raised themselves to the position, the rights and titles of the क्षत्रियs and were recognised as such. Being outcasted from a caste, which is an event of daily occurrence, is only getting incorporated with some other.

Not only is this true so far as those Hindus only who believe in the caste system based on the Vedic tenents are concerned, but even in the case of अवैदिक sects of the Hindu people. As it was true in the Buddhistic period that a Buddhist father, a वैदिक mother, a जैन son, could be found in a single joint family, so even to-day. जैनs and वैष्णवs intermarry in Gujrath. शीखs and सनातनीs in Punjab and Sind. More over to-day's मानभाव or लिंगायत or शीख or सत्नामी is yesterday's हिंदु, and to-day's हिंदु may be to-morrows लिंगायत or ब्रह्मो or शीख.

And no word can give a full expression to this racial unity of our people as the epithet Hindu does. Some of us were आर्यन्s and some अनार्यन्s; but आयरs and नायरs—we were all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us are ब्राह्मणs and some नामशूद्रs or पंचमs; but ब्राह्मणs or चांडालs—we are all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us are दाक्षिणात्यs and some गौडs; but गौडs or सारस्वतs—we are all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us were राक्षसs and some यक्षs; but राक्षसs or यक्षs–we are all Hindus and own a common

blood. Some of us were वानरs and some किन्नरs ; but वानरs or or नरs—we are all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us are जैनs and some जंगमs; but जैनs or जंगमs—we are all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us are monists some pantheists; some theists and some athiests. But monothiests or athiests–we are all Hindus and own a common blood. We are not only a राष्ट्र but a जाति, a born brotherhood. Nothing else counts, it is after all a question of heart. We *feel* that the same ancient blood that coursed through the veins of राम and कृष्ण, बुद्ध and महावीर, नानक and चैतन्य, वसव and माधव, of रोहिदास and तिरुवेल्लवर, courses through out the Hindudom from vein to vein, pulsates from heart to heart. We *feel* we are a जाति—a race bound together by the dearest ties of blood—and therefore it must be so.

After all there is throughout this world so far as man is concerned but a single race—the Human race ; kept alive by one common blood the Human blood. All other talk is at best provisional, a makeshift, and only relatively true. Nature is constantly trying to overthrow the artificial barriers you raise betwen race and race. To try to prevent the commingling of blood is to build on sands. Sexual attraction has proved more powerful than all the commands of all the prophets put together. Even as it is, not even the aborigines of the Andamans are without some sprinkling of the so called आर्यन् blood in their veins and *vice versa*. Truely speaking all that any one of us can claim, all that history entitles one to claim, is that one has the blood of all mankind in one's veins. The funda-

mental unity of man from pole to pole is true—all else only relatively so.

And speaking relatively alone, no people in the world can more justly claim to get recognised as a racial unit than the Hindus and perhaps the Jews. A Hindu marrying a Hindu may loose his caste but not his हिंदुत्व. A Hindu, believing in any theoretical or philosophical or social system, orthodox or hetrodox, provided it is unquestioably indigenous and founded by a Hindu, may loose his sect but not his हिंदुत्व—his Hinduness—because the most important essential which determines it, is the inheritance of the Hindu blood. Therefore all those who love the land that stretches from सिंधु to सिंधु, from Indus to Seas, as their father-land and consequently claim to inherit the blood of the race that has evolved, by incorporation and adaptation, from the ancient सप्तसिंधुs, can be said to possess two of the most essential requisites of हिंदुत्व.

But only two: because a moment's consideration would show that these two qualifications of एक राष्ट्र and एक जाति—of a common fatherland and therefore of a common blood—cannot exhaust all the requisites of हिंदुत्व. The majority of the Indian Mohomedans may, if free from the prejudices born of ignorance, come to love our land as their fatherland, as the patriotic and noble-minded amongst them have always been doing. The story of their conversions, forcible in millions of cases, is too recent to make them forget, even if they like to do so, that they inherit Hindu blood in their veins. But can we, who here are concerned with investigating into facts as

they are and not as they should be, recognize these Mohamedans as Hindus? Many a Mohamedan community in Kashmere and other parts of India as well as the Christians in South India observe our caste rules to such an extent as to marry generally within the pale of their castes alone; yet, it is clear that though their original Hindu blood is thus almost unaffected by an alien adulteration, yet they cannot be called Hindus in the sense in which that term is actually understood. Because, we Hindus are bound together not only by the tie of the love we bear to a common fatherland and by the common blood that courses through our veins and keeps our hearts throbbing and our affections warm, but also by the tie of a common homage we pay to our great civilization—our Hindu culture, which could not be better rendered than by the word संस्कृति suggestive as it is of that langauge, the संस्कृत, which has been the chosen means of expression and preservation of that culture, of all that was best and worth preserving in the history of our race. We are one because we are a राष्ट्र, a जाति and own a common संस्क्ाति.

But what is civilization ? Civilization is the expression of the mind of man. Civilization is the account of what man had made of matter. If matter is the creation of the Lord then civilization is the miniature secondary creation of man. At its best it is the perfect triumph of the soul of man over matter and man alike. Wherever and to the extent to which man has succeeded in moulding matter to the delight of his soul, civilization begins. And it triumphs when he has tapped all the sources of Supreme Delight, satisfying the

Spiritual aspirations of his Being towards strength and beauty and love, realising Life in all its fulness and richness.

The story of the civilization of a nation is the story of its Thoughts, its Action and its Achievements. Literature and art tell us of its thoughts ; history and social institutions of its actions and achievements. In none of these can man remain isolated. The premitive " डुंगी " (caneo) of the Andamanese can truly claim to have influenced the up-to-date dread-naughts of America. The latest adventure of fashion amongst the fair sex in Paris is but the lineal descendant of the bunch of leaves stuck in the girdle-string which constitutes the perfection of the toilet of a " पातुआ " girl..

And yet a ' Dungi ' remains a Dungi and a dreadnaught a dreadnaught ; they are too much more unlike each other than like to be identified as one and the same. Even so, although the Hindus have lent much and borrowed much like any other people yet, their civilization is too characteristic to be mistaken for any other cultural unit. And secondly, however striking their mutual differences be, they are too much more like each other than unlike, to be denied the right of being recognized as a cultural unit amongst other such units in the world owning a common history, a common literature and a common civilization.

Paradoxical as it may sound to those who have fallen victims to the interested or ignorant cry that has secured the ear of the present world that the Hindus have no history it never the less remains true that Hindus are about the only people who have succeeded in preserving their history—

riding through earthquakes, bridging over deluges! It begins with their Vedas which are the first extant chapter of the story of our race. The first cradle songs that every Hindu girl listens to, sings of Sita, the good. Some of us worship Rama as an incarnation, some admire him as a hero and a warrior, all love him as the most illustrtrious representative monarch of our race. Maruti and Bheemsen are the never failing source of strength and physical perfection to the Hindu youth; Savitri and Damyanti, the never failing ideals of constancy and chastity to the Hindu maid. The love that राधा made to the Divine Cowherd in Gokul finds its echo wherever a Hindu lover kisses his beloved. The giant struggle of the Kurus, the set duels of Arjun and Karna, of Bhim and Dusshasan, that took place on the field of Kurukshetra thousands of years ago, are rehearsed in all their thrill from cottage to cottage and from palace to palace. Abhimanyu could not have been dearer to अर्जुन than he is to us. From Ceylon to Kashmere—Hindusthan daily sheds tears as lovingly and as bitterly as his father did at the mention of the fall of that lotus-eyed youth. What more shall we say? The story of रामायण and महाभारत alone would bring us together and weld into a race even if we be scattered to all the four winds like a handful of sand. I read the life of a Mazzini and I exclaim "how patriotic *they* are," I read the life of a Madhavacharya and exclaim "how patriotic *we* are!" The fall of पृथ्वीराज is bewailed in Bengal; the martyred sons of Govindsing, in Maharastra. An Arya Samajist historian in the extreme north feels that Harihar and Bukka of the ex-

treme south fought for him; and a Sanatanist historian in the extreme south feels that Guru Tejbahadur died for him. We had kings in common, we had kingdoms in common. We had stability in common, we had movements in common. We had triumphs in common, and disasters in common. The names of मोकावसय्या and पिसाळ, a जयचंद and काळापहाड, make us all feel as sinners do. The names of अशोक, भास्कराचार्य, पाणिनी and कपिल leave us all electrified with a sense of personal elevation.

But what about the internecine wars amongst Hindus? We answer, what about the wars of Roses amongst the English? What of internecine struggle of states against states, sects against sects, class against class, each invoking foreign help against his own country-men, in Italy, in Germany, in France, in America? Are they still a people, a nation, and do they possess a common history? If they do the Hindus do. If the Hindus do not possess a common history then none in the world does.

As our History tells the story of the Action of our race so does our literature taken in its fullest sense tell the story of the Thought of our race. Thought, they say, is inseparable from word; and our literature inseparable from our common tongue, the संस्कृत. Verily it is our mother tongue.—the tongue in which the mothers of our race spoke and which has given birth to all our present tongues. Our Gods spoke in संस्कृत, our sages thought in संस्कृत, our poets wrote in संस्कृत All that is best in us-the best thoughts, the best idea, the best line—seeks instinctively to clothe itself in संस्कृत. To mil-

lions it is still the language of their Gods ; to others it is the language of their ancestors ; to all it is the language *par excellence* ; a common inheritance, a common treasure, that enriches all the family of our sister languages, गुजराथी and गुरुमुखी, सिंधीandहिंदी,तामिलandतेलगु,महाराष्ट्रीaudमल्यालम्, बंगालीandसिंघाली, constitutes the vital nerve thread that runs through us all vivifying and toning our feelings and aspirations into a harmonious whole. It is not a language alone ; to many Hindus, it is a मंत्र, to all it is a music. The Vedas do not constitute an authority for all जैनs. But the Vedas as the most ancient work and the history of their race belong to जैनs as much as to any of us. आदिपुराण was not written by a सनातनी yet the आदिपुराण is the common inheritance of the सनातनीs and जैनs. The बसवपुराण is the bible of the लिंगायतs; but it belongs to Lingayat and non-Lingayat Hindus alike, as one of the foremost and historical kanaree work extant. विचित्रनाटक of गुरुगोविंद is as truly the property of a Hindu in Bengal as the चैतन्यचरित्रामृत is of a Sikh. कालिदास and भवभूति, चरक and सुश्रुत, आर्यभट्ट and वराहमिहिर, भास and अश्वघोष, जयदेव and जगन्नाथ, wrote for us all, appeal to us all, are the cherished possession of us all. Let the work of कंब the तामिल poet and say, a copy of Hafiz be kept before a Hindu in Bengal and if he be asked, " what belongs to you of these ?" he would instinctively say, 'कंब is mine!" let a copy of the work of रवींद्रनाथ and one of Shakespeare be kept before a Hindu in Maharashtra, he would claim " रवींद्र ! रवींद्र is mine. "

The works of art and architecture are also a common inheritance of our race, whether they be representative of वैदिक

or अवैदिक school of thought. For all the labourers who wroght them, the masters who guided them, the tax-payers who financed them, and the kings who organised them, whether वैदिक or अवैदिक belonged to the great race that inhabits and owns this land from सिंधु to सिंधु—the Hindu race. Those who are सनातनीs to-day have contributed and laboured for the Buddhistic monuments of art and architecture then; while those who were Buddhistic then have contributed to and laboured for the monuments of the सनातनी art and architecture now.

Common institutions and a common law that sanctions and sanctifies them, however they may differ in details, are never the less both the cause and the effect of the basic unity of our race. The Hindu law with the underlying principles of Hindu Jurisprudence whatever the superficial differences be, and howsoever contradictory a detail here or an injunction there may seem to be, is too organic a growth to loose its individuality by the manifold changes wrought by times and climes. In spite of the feverish speed with which the law machines in the different states of America and British Commonwealth keep manufacturing and modelling laws, we still acknowledge the principles of Jurisprudence and the lines of growth that underlie their code to constitute a single whole. The English law, or the Roman Jurisprudence, or the American law could not be designated as such if eternal identity or a dead level similarity is expected. The Mohamedan law retains its individuality in spite of such damaging exceptions to it as the Khojas or the Bohras who, like some

other Mohamedan communities, observe the Hindu law in regulating some departments of their life, notably in matters of inheritance. Some of the Hindu customs in Maharastra or Punjab may differ from some in Bengal or Sind. But, the similarity in all other details is so great that the law of the Maharashtra as a whole seems to be an echo of the law books ruling our brothers in Bengal or Sindh and *vice versa.* When all the rules, customs and laws observed by any given community are collected together it can immediately be found to be nothing but a fitting chapter of the Hindu law while no amount of ingenuity or torture can fit it in say, the English or Mohamadan or the Japanese law books.

We have feasts and festivals in common. We have rites and rituals in common. The दसरा and दिवाळी, the राखीबंधन and the होळी, are welcomed wherever a Hindu breathes. शीखs and जैनs,ब्राह्मणs & पंचमs alike, you would find the whole Hindu kingdom *enfete* on the Divali day. Not only Hindusthan, but the Greater Hindusthan that is fast growing in all the continents of the world. Not even a cottage in the तराई forests could be found on that night that has not shown its little light! While the राखी day would reveal to you every Hindu soul from the delighted damsels of Punjab to the austere Brahmins of Madras tying the silken tie that,' heart to heart and mind to mind, in body and in soul, can bind.' Yet we have deliberately refrained ourselves from referring to any religious beliefs that we as a race may hold in common. Nor had we referred to any institution or event or custom in its religious aspect or significance. Because we wanted to deal with

the essentials of हिंदुत्व not in the light of any "ism" but from a racial point of view; and yet even from a national and racial point of view do the different places of pilgrimage constitute, a common inheritance of our Hindu race. The रथयात्रा festival at जगन्नाथ, the वैशाखी at अमृतसर, the कुंभ and the अर्धकुंभ all these great gatherings had been the real and living congresses of our people that kept the current of life and thought coursing through out our body politic. The qaint customs and ceremonies and sacraments they involve, observed by some as a religious duty, by others as social amenities, impress upon each individual that he can live best only through the common and corporate life of the Hindu race.

These then in short—and the subject in hand does not permit us to be exhaustive on this point—constitute the essence of our civilization and mark us out a cultural unit. We Hindus are not only a राष्ट्र, a जाति, but and as a consequence of being both, own a common संस्क्राति expressed and preserved chiefly and originally through संस्कृत, the real Mother-tongue of our race. Everyone who is a Hindu inherits this संस्कृति and owes his spiritual being to it as truly as he owes his physical one to the land and the blood of his forefathers.

A Hindu then is he who feels attachment to the land that extends from सिंधु to सिंधु as the land of his forefathers—as his Fatherland; who inherits the blood of the greatrace whose first and discernible source could be traced by the Hymalayan altitudes of the Vedic सप्तसिंधुs and which,

assimiliating all that was incorporated and ennobling all that was assimilated has grown into and come to be known as the Hindu people ; and who, as a consequence of the fore going attributes, has inherited and claims as his own the हिंदु संस्कृति, the Hindu civilization, as represented in a common history, common heroes, a common literature, a common art, a common law and a common jurisprudence, common fairs and festivals, rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments. Not that, every Hindu has all these details of the Hindu संस्कृति down to each syllable common with other Hindus ; but that, he has more of it common with his Hindu brothers than with, say, an Arab or an Englishman. Not that, a non-Hindu does not hold any of these details in common with a Hindu but that, he differs more from a Hindu than he agrees with. That is why Christian and Mohamedan communities, who were but very recently Hindus and in majority of cases had been at least in their first generation most unwilling denizens of their new fold, claim though they might a common fatherland, and an almost pure Hindu blood and parentage with us, cannot be recognised as Hindus; as, since their adoption of the new cult they had ceased to own Hindu संस्कृति as a whole. They belong, or feel that they belong, to a cultural unit altogether different from the Hindu one. Their heroes and their hero-worship, their fairs and their festivals, their ideals and their outlook of life, have now ceased to be common with ours. Thus the presence of this third essential of हिंदुत्व which requires of every Hindu an uncommon and loving attachment to his racial संस्कृति enables us most perfectly to

determine the nature of हिंदुत्व without any danger of using over-lapping or exclusive attributes.

But take the case of a patriotic Bohra or a Khoja countryman of ours. He loves our land of हिंदुस्थान as his fatherland which, indisputably, is the land of his forefathers. He possesses—in certain cases they do—pure Hindu blood; especially if he is the first convert to Mohamedanism he must be allowed to claim to inherit the blood of Hindu parents. He, as an intelligent and reasonable man, loves our history and our heroes, in fact the Bohras and the Khojas, as a community, worship as heroes or great ten Avatars only adding Mohamad as the elventh. He is actually, along with his community-Subject to the Hindu law—the law of his forefathers. He is; so far as the three essentials of राष्ट्र, जाति and संस्कृति are con, cerned, a Hindu. He may differ as regards a few festivals or may add a few more heroes to the pantheon of his supermen or demigods. But we have repeatedly said that difference in details here or emphasis there, does not throw us outside the pale of Hundu संस्कृति. The sub-communities amongst the Hindus observe many a custom, not only contradictory but even, conflicting with customs of other Hindu communities. Yet both of them are Hindus. So also in the above cases of a patriotic Bohra or a Christian or a Khoja, who could satisfy the three required qualifications of हिंदुत्व to such a degree as that, why should he not be recognised as a Hindu?

He would certainly have been recognised as such but for his attitude towards a single detail—which, though it is covered by the word संस्कृति or culture, is yet too important

to be lost in the multitude of other attributes, and therefore deserves a special treatment and analysis ; which again brings us face to face with the question which, involing as it does the religious aspect of Hundutva, had often been avoided by us, not because we fight shy of it, but on account of our wish to fight it out all the more thoroughly and effectively. For, we are now better equipped to determine the significance and attempt an analysis of the two terms Hinduism and हिंदुत्व.

VI

The words हिंदुत्व and Hinduism being both of them derived from the word हिंदु must necessarily be understood to refer to the whole of the Hindu people. Any definition of Hinduism that leaves out any important section of our people and forces them either to play false to their convictions or to go outside the pale of हिंदुत्व stands self condemned. Hinduism means the system of religious beliefs found common amongst the Hindu people. And the only way to find out what those religious beliefs of the Hindus are, *i.e.*, what constitutes Hinduism, you must first define a Hindu. But forgetting this chief implication of the word Hinduism which clearly presupposes an independant conception of a Hindu, many a people go about to determine the essentilas of Hinduism and finding none so satisfactory as to include, without overlapping, all our Hindu communities come to the desperate conclusion—which does not satify them either,—that therefore those communities are not Hindus at all! because,—not that the definition they had framed is open to the fault of exclusion but because those communities do not subject themselves to the required tenets which these gentleman have thought it fit to label as "Hinduism"! This way of answering the question 'who is a Hindu" is really preposterous and has given rise to so much of bitterness amongst some, of our brothren of the अवैदिक school of thought, the शिखs the जैनs, the देव-समाजीs and even our patriotic and progressive आर्यसमाजीs.

" Who is a Hindu ?"—he, who is subject to the tenets of

Hinduism. Very well. What is Hinduism ?—those tenets to which the Hindus are subjected ! This is very nearly arguing in a circle and can never lead to a satisfactory solution. Many of our friends who have been on this wrong track have come back to tell us " there is no such people as Hindus at all !" If some Indian, as gifted as that Englishman who first coined the word Hinduism, coins a parallel word " Englishism " proceeds to find out the underlying unity of beliefs amongst the English people, gets disgusted with thousands of sects and societies from the Jews to the Jacobins, from Trinity to Utility, and comes out to announce that " there are no such people as the English at all " he would not make himself more ridiculous than those who declare in cold print " there is nothing as a Hindu people." Any one who wants to see what a confusion of thought prevails on the point and how the failure to analyse separately the two terms हिंदुत्व and Hinduism renders that confusion worst confounded may do well to go through the booklet 'Essentials of Hinduism' published by the enterprising 'Natesan & Co'.

Hinduism means the 'ism' of the Hindus ; and as the word Hindu has been derived from the word सिंधु, the Indus, meaning primarily all the people who reside on the land that extends from सिंधु to सिंधु, Hinduism must necessarily mean the religion or the religions that are peculiar and native to this land and this people. If we are unable to reduce the different tenets and beliefs to a single system of religion then the only way would be to cease to maintain that Hinduism is a system and to say that it is a set of systems consistent

with, or if you like contradictory or even conflicting with each other. But in no case can you advance this your failure to determine the meaning of Hinduism as a ground to doubt the existence of a Hindu nation itself, or worse still to commit sacrilege in hurting the feelings of our अवैदिक Hindu brethren and वैदिक Hindu brethren alike, by relegating any of them to the Non-Hindu pale .

The limits of this essay do not permit us to determine the nature or the essentials of Hinduism or to try to discuss it at any great length. As we have shown above the enquiry into what is Hinduism can only begin after the question 'who is a Hindu' is rightly answered by determining the essentials of हिंदुत्व; and as it is only with these essentials of हिंदुत्व. which enable us to know 'who is a Hindu,' that this our present enquiry is concerned, the discussion of Hinduism falls necessarily outside of our scope. We have to take cognizance of it only so far as it trespasses in the field of our special charge . Hinduism is a word that properly speaking should be applied to all the religious beliefs that the different communities of the Hindu people hold. But it is generally applied to that system of religion which the majority of the Hindu people follow. It is natural that a religion or a country or a community should derive its name from the characteristic feature which is common to an overwhelming majority that constitutes or contributes to it. It is also convenient for easy reference or parlance. But a convenient term that is not only delusive but harmful and positively misleading should not any longer be allowed to blind our judgment. The ma-

jority of the Hindus contributes to that system of religion which could fitly be described by the attribute that constitutes its special feature, as 'श्रुतिस्मृतिपुराणोक्त" धर्म or सनातनधर्म. They would not object if it even be called वैदिक धर्म. But besides these there are other Hindus who reject, either partly or wholly, the authority—some of the पुराणs, some of the स्मृतिs and some of the श्रुतिs themselves. But if you identify the religion of the Hindus with the religion of the majority only and call it orthodox Hinduism, then the different heterodox communities, being Hindus themselves rightly resent this usurpation of हिंदुत्व by the majority, as well as their unjustifiable exclusion. The religion of the minorities also requires a name. But if you call the so-called orthodox religion alone as Hinduism then naturally it follows that the religion of the so called heterodox is not Hinduism! The next most fatal step being that therefore those sections are not Hindus at all!! But this inference seems as staggering even to those who had unwillingly given whole hearted support to the premises which have made it logically inevitable that while hating to own it they hardly know how to avoid arriving at it. And thus we find that while millions of our Shikhs, Jains, Lingayats, several Samajis and others would deeply resent to be told that they—whose fathers' fathers up to the tenth generations had the blood of Hindus in their veins—had suddenly ceased to be Hindus!—yet a section amongst them takes it most emphatically for granted that they had been faced with a choice that either they should consent to be a party to those customs and beliefs

which they had in their puritanic or progressive zeal rejected as superstitions, or they should cease to belong to that race to which their forefathers belonged.

All this bitterness is mostly due to the wrong use of the word Hinduism to denote the religion of the majority only. Either the word should be restored to its proper significance to denote the religions of all Hindus or if you fail to do that it should be dropped altogether. The religion of the majority of the Hindus could be best denoted by the ancient accepted appellation, the सनातन धर्म or the श्रुतिस्मृतिपुराणोक्त धर्म or the वैदिक धर्म; while the religions of the remaining Hindus would continue to be denoted by their respective and accepted names शखि धर्म or आर्य धर्म or जैन धर्म or बुद्ध धर्म Whenever the necessity of denoting these धर्मs as a whole arises then alone we may be justified in denoting them by the generic term हिंदु धर्म or Hinduism. Thus their would be no loss either in clearness, or in conciseness but on the other hand a gain both in precision and unambiguity which by removing the cause of suspicion in our minor communities and resentment in the major ones would once more unite us all Hindus under our ancient banner representing a common race and a common civilization.

The earliest records that we have got of the religious beliefs of any Indian community—not to speak of mankind itself—are the Vedas. The Vedic nation of the सप्तसिंधुs was subdivided into many a tribe and class. But although the majority then held a faith that we for simplicity call Vedic religion, yet it was not contributed to by an important

minority of the सिंधुs themselves. The पाणिs, theदासs, the व्रात्यs and many others from time to time seem to have either seceded from or never belonged to the orthodox church and yet racially and nationally they were conscious of being a people by themselves. There was such a thing as Vedic religion, but it could not be even then identified with सिंधु--धर्म; for the latter term, had it been coined, would have naturally meant the set of religions prevailing in सप्तसिंधुs, orthodox as well as heterodox. By a process of elimination and assimilation the race of the सिंधुs at last grew into the race of हिंदुs—and the land of the सिंधुs i.e. सिंधुस्थान, into the land of the हिंदुs i.e. हिंदुस्थान. While their orthodox and the heterodox schools of religions have,—having tested much, dared much andknown much,--having subjected to the most searching examination possible till then, all that lay between the grandest and the tiniest, from the atom to the Atman, from the परमाणु to the परब्रह्म,--having sounded the deepest secrets of thoughts and having sored to the highest altitudes of Ecstasy,—given birth to a synthesis that sympathises with all aspirants towards truth from the Monist to the Atheist. Truth its goal, Realization its method. It is neither Vedic nor non-Vedic, it is both. It is the veritable science of religion applied. This is हिंदुधर्म—the conclusion of the conclusions arrived at by harmonising the detailed experiences of all the schools of religious thought—वैदिक, सनातनी, जैन, बौद्ध, शीख or देवसमाजी. Each one and every one of those systems or sects which are the direct descendants & developments of the religious beliefs वैदिक and अवैदिक, that obtained in the land of the सप्तसिंधुs

or in the other unrecorded communities in other parts of India in the Vedic period, belongs to and is a part integral of हिंदुधर्म.

Therefore the वैदिक or the सनातन धर्म itself is merely a sect of Hinduism or हिंदुधर्म—however over-whelming be the majority that contributes to its tenets. It was a definition of this सनातन धर्म which the late Lokamanya Tilak framed in the famous verses "प्रामाण्यबुद्धिर्वेदेषु साधनानामनेकता । उपास्यानाम-नियम एतद्धर्मस्य लक्षणम् ॥" In a learned article that he had contributed to the चित्रमयजगत्, which bears the mark of his deep erudition and insight, the Lokamanya in an attempt to develop this more or less negative definition into a positive one, had clearly suggested that he had an eye, not on हिंदुत्व as such but, only on what was popularly called हिंदुधर्म; and had also admitted that it could hardly include in its sweep the आर्यसमाजिस and other sects which never the less are racially and nationally Hindus of Hindus. That definition, excellent so far as it goes, is in fact not a definition of हिंदुधर्म, much less of हिंदुत्व, but of सनातन धर्म—the श्रुतिस्मृतिपुराणोक्त sect, which being the most popular of all sects of हिंदुधर्म was naturally but loosely mistaken for हिंदुधर्म itself.

Thus हिंदुधर्म being etymologically as well as actually and in its religious aspects only, (for धर्म is not merely religion) the religion of the Hindus, it necessarily partakes of all the essentials that characterise a Hindu. We have found that the first important essential qualification of a Hindu is—that, to him the land that extends from सिंधु to सिंधु is the

पितृभू, the मातृभू, the land of his partiarchs and forefathers. The system or set of religions which we call हिंदुधर्म—वैदिक and अवैदिक--are as truly the children of this soil as the men whose thoughts they are or who "saw" the Truth revealed in them. To हिंदुधर्म with all its sects and systems this land सिंधुस्थान is the land of its revelation—the land of its birth on this human plane. As the Ganges, though flowing out of the lotus feet of Vishnu himself is even to the most orthodox devotee and mystic so far as human plane is concerned, the daughter of the Himalayas, even so, this land is the birth-place—the मातृभू and the पितृभू--of that तत्वज्ञान which in its religious aspect is signified as हिंदुधर्म. The second most important essential of हिंदुत्व is that a Hindu is a descendant of Hindu parents, claims to have the blood of the ancient सिंधुs and the race that sprang from them in his veins. This also is true of the different schools of religion of the Hindus. For, they too being either founded by or revealed to the Hindu sages and seers, are the moral and cultural and spiritual descendants and development of the Thought of the सप्तसिंधुs through the process of assimilation and elimination, as we are of their Seed. Not only is हिंदुधर्म the growth of the natural environments and of the thought of the Hindus but also of the संस्कृति or culture of the Hindus. The environmental frames in which its scenes, whether of the वैदिक period, or of बौद्ध, जैन or any extremely modern ones of चैतन्य, चक्रधर, बसव, नानक, दयानंद or राजा राममोहन, are set, the technical terms and the language that furnished expression to its highest revelation and ecstacies, its myhtology and its philosophy, the conceptions

it controverted and the conceptions it adopted, have indelible stamp of Hindu culture, of Hindu संस्कृति, impressed upon them. हिंदुधर्म of all shades and schools, lives and grows and has its being in the atmosphere of Hindu culture, and the धर्म of a Hindu being so completely identified with the land of the Hindus, this land to him is not only a पितृभू but a पुण्यभू, not only a fatherland but a holy land.

Yes; this भारतभूमि, this सिंधुस्थान, this land of ours that stretches from सिंधु to सिंधु is our पुण्यभूमि, for it was in this land that the Founders of our faith and the Seers to whom 'वेद' the Knowledge was revealed, from वैदिक seers to दयानंद, from जिन to महावीर, from बुद्ध to नागसेन, from नानक to गोविंद, from वंदा to बसव, from चक्रधर to चैतन्य, from रामदास to राममोहन, our Gurus and Godmen were born and bred. The very dust of its paths echoes the footfalls of our Prophets and Gurus. Sacred are its rivers, hallowed its groves, for it was either on their moonlit ghats or under their eventide long shadows, that the deepest problems of life, of man, soul and God, of ब्रह्म and माया, were debated and discussed by a बुद्ध or a शंकर. Ah! every hill and dell instinct with memories of a कपिल or a व्यास, शंकर or रामदास. Here भगीरथ rules, there कुरुक्षेत्र lies. Here रामचंद्र made his first halt of an exile, there जानकी saw the golden deer and foundly pressed her lover to kill it. Here the divine cowherd played on his flute that made every heart in गोकुल dance in harmony as if in a hypnotised sleep. Here is बोधिवृक्ष, here the deer park. Here महावीर entered निर्वाण. Here stood crowds of worshippers amongst whom नानक sat and sang the आरती

" गगन थाल रविचंद दीपक बने ! " Here गोपीचंद the king took on vows of गोपीचंद the जोगी and with a bowl in his hand knocked at his sister's door for handful of alms ! Here the son of बंदाबहादुर was hacked to pieces before the eyes of his father and the young bleeding heart of the son thrust in the father's mouth for the fault of dying as a Hindu ! Every stone here has a story of martyrdom to tell ! Every inch of thy soil, Oh mother ! has been a sacrificial ground ! Not only 'where the कृष्णसार is found' but from काश्मीर to सिंहल it is 'यज्ञीयभूमि,' santcified with a ज्ञानयज्ञ or an आत्मयज्ञ. So to every Hindu, from the संताल to the साधु, this भारतभूमि, this सिंधुस्थान, is at once a पितृभू and a पुण्यभू.

That is why in the case of some of our Mohamedan or Christian countrymen who had originally been forcibly converted to Non-Hindu religion and who consequently have inherited, along with Hindus, a common Father-land and greater part of the wealth of common culture—language, law, customs, folklore and history—are not and cannot be recognized as Hindus. For though हिंदुस्थान to them is पितृभू as to any other हिंदु yet it is not to them a पुण्यभू too. Their Holyland is far off in Arabia or Palestine. Their mythology and godmen, ideas and heroes are not the chirlden of this soil. Consequently their names and their outlook smack of foreign origin. Their love is divided. Nay, if some of them be really believing what they profess to do, then there can be no choice—they must to a man set their Holy-land above their Father-land in their love and allegiance. That is but natural. We are not

condemning nor are we lamenting. We are simply telling facts as they stand. We have tried to determine the essentials of हिंदुत्व and in doing so we have discovered that the Bohras and such other Mohamadan or Christian communities possess all the essential qualifications of हिंदुत्व but one: and that is that they do not look upon India as their Holyland.

It is not a question of embracing any doctrine propounding any new theory of the interpretation of God and Soul and Man. For we honestly believe that the Hindu Thought—we are not speaking of any religion which is dogma—has exhausted the very possibilities of human speculation as to the nature of the Unknown—if not the Unknownable, or the nature of the relation between *that* and *thou*. Are you a monist—a monotheist—a pantheist—an atheist—an agnostic? Here is ample room, oh soul! whatever thou art, to love and grow to thy fullest height and satisfaction in this Temple of temples, that stands on no personal foundation, but on the broad and deep and strong foundation of Truth. Why goest then to fill thy little pitcher to wells far off, when thou standest on the banks of the crystal-streamed Ganges herself? Does not the blood in your veins, oh brother, of our common fore-fathers cry aloud with the recollections of the dear old scenes and ties from which they were so cruelly snatched away at the point of sword? Then come ye back to the fold of your brothers and sisters who with arms extended are standing at the open gate to welcome you—their long lost kith and kin. Where can you find more freedom of worship than in this

land where a चार्वाक could preach atheism from the steps of the temple of महाकाल!—more freedom of social organisation than in the Hindu society where from the Patnas of Orissa to the Pandits of Benares, from the संताळs to the साधुs, each can develop a distinct social type of polity or organize a new one. Verily यदेहास्ति न सर्वत्र यन्नेहास्ति न कुत्रचित् । Whatever could be found in the world is found here too. And if anything is not found here it could be founed no where. Ye, who by race, by blood, by culture, by nationality possess almost all the essentials of हिंदुत्व and had been forcibly snatched out of our ancestral Home by the hand of Violence—ye have only to render whole hearted love to our common Mother and recognize her not only as पितृभू but even as a पुण्यभू, and ye would be most welcome to the Hindu fold.

This is a choice which our country-men and our old kith and kin the Bohras, Khojas, Mamons and other Mohamedan and Christians communities are free to make—a choice again which must be a choice of love. But as long as they are not minded thus, so long they cannot be recognized as Hindus. We are it must be remmebered, trying to analyse and determine the essentials of हिंदुत्व as that word is actually understood to signify and would not be justified to strain it in its application to suit any preconceived notions or party convenience.

A Hindu therefore, to sum up the conclusions arrived at, is he who looks upon the land that extends from सिंधु to सिंधु, from the Indus to the Seas, as the land of his forefathers—his पितृभू; who inherits the blood of that race whose first discernible source could be traced to the Vedic सप्तसिंधs

and which on its onward march, assimilating much that was incorporated and ennobling much that was assimilated, has come to be known as the Hindu people; who has inherited and claims as his own the culture of that race, as expressed chiefly in their common classic langauge the संस्कृत and represented by a common history, a common literature, art and architecture, law and jurisprudence, rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments, fairs and festivals; and who above all addresses this land, this सिंधुस्थान, as his पुण्यभू, as his Holyland—the land of his prophets and seers, of his god-men and gurus, the land of piety and pilgrimage. These are the essentials of हिंदुत्व—a common राष्ट्र, a common जाति, and a common संस्कृति. All these essentials could best be smmed up by stating in brief that he is a हिंदु to whom सिंधुस्थान is not only a पितृभू but also a पुण्यभू. For the first two essentials of हिंदुत्व—राष्ट्र and जाति—are clearly denoted and connoted by the word पितृभू: while the third essential of संस्काति is pre-eminently implied by the word पुण्यभू: as it is precisely संस्क्राति including संस्कारs i.e., rites and rituals ceremanies and sacraments, that makes a land a Holyland. To make the definition more handy, we may be allowed to compress it in a couplet :—

आसिंधु सिंधुपर्यंता यस्य भारतभूमिका
पितृभूः पुण्यभूश्चैव स वै हिंदुरितिस्मृतः ॥

VII

The rough analysis to which the conception of हिंदुत्व was subjected in the foregoing section has enabled us to frame a working definition embodying or rather indicating the salient essentials of it. It now remains to see how far this general definition can stand a detailed examination that could be best conducted by testing a few typical and some of the most different cases which have in fact made the necessity of a definition so badly felt. While developing it we have tried at each step to free it, so far as it is possible to do so in the case of so comprehensive and elusive a generalization as that, from the defect of being overlapping. If we find in testing a few typical cases in the light of this definition that they all fit in well then we may be sure that it is free from the opposite defect of exclusiveness too. We have seen that it is not open to अतिव्याप्ति; it remains to be seen whether it is not open to अव्याप्ति also.

The geographical divisions that obtain amongst the Hindus would, at a glance, be seen to harmonise well with the spirit of our definition. The fundamental basis of it is the land आसिंधु सिंधुपर्यंता, and although many of our brethern, and especially those who had been the most undoubted descendants of the ancient सिंधुs, and who besides are the very people

that to this day have never changed the ancient name either of their land or of their race, and are called to day as five thousand years ago, ' सिंधी ', the children of सिंधुदेश, inhabit on other bank of the Indus, yet as in the mention of a river the mention of both its banks is implied as a matter of course so that part of सिंध which constitutes the western bank of Indus is a natural part of सिंधुस्थान and is covered by our definition. Secondly, accessories to the mainland are always known by the name of the latter. And thirdly, our Hindu people on that side of the Sindhu had through out history looked upon this land of भारतवर्ष as their real पितृभू as well as पुण्यभू. Thay had never been guilty of matricide in attempting to set up the patch they inhabit as their only पितृभू or only पुण्यभू. On the other hand their बनारस and कैलास and गंगोत्री are our बनारस and कैलास and गंगोत्री. From the Vedic time they are a part integral of भारतवर्ष. 'सिंधुशिविसौवीरs' ar ementioned in रामायण and महाभारत as the rightful constituents of the great Hindu confederacy and commonwealth. They belong to our राष्ट्र, to our जाति and to our संस्कृति. Therefore they are Hindus and their case is well covered by our definition.

But even if one rejects the contention that the ownership of a river does imply, unless otherwise stated, the ownership of both its banks yet the definition remains as sound as ever and applies to our सिंधी brethren on other grounds. For, apart from the special case of our सिंधी brethren that inhabit on the other side of the Indus, there are hundreds of thousands of Hindus who have settled in all parts of the world. A time may come when these our Hindu

colonists, who even to-day are the dominating factor in trade, numbers, capacity and intellect in their respective lands, may come to own a whole country and form a separate state. But will this simple fact of residence in lands other than हिंदुस्थान render one a non-Hindu? Certainly not; for the first essential of हिंदुत्व is not that a man must not reside in lands outside India, but that wherever he or his descendants may happen to be he must recognize सिंधुस्थान as the land of his forefathers. Nay more; it is not a question of recognition either. If his ancestors came from India as Hindus he cannot help recognizing India as his पितृभू. So this definition of हिंदुत्व is compatiable with any conceivable expansion of our Hindu people. Let our colonists continue unabated their labours of founding a Greater India, a महाभारत, to the best of their capacities and contribute all that is best in our civilization to the upbuilding of Humanity. Let them enrich the people that inhabit the earth from Pole to Pole with their virtues and let them in return enrich their own country and race by inbibing all that is healthy and true wherever found. हिंदुत्व does not clip the wings of the Himalayan eagles but only adds to their urge. So long as ye, Oh Hindus, look upon हिंदुस्थान as the land of your forefathers and as the land of your prophets, and cherish the prizeless heritage of their culture and their blood, so long nothing can stand in the way of your desire to expand. The only geographical limits of हिंदुत्व are the limits of our earth!

So far as the racial aspect of our definition is concerned we cannot think of any exception that can seriously challenge its

validity. Just as in England we find Iberians, Kelts, Angles, Saxons, Danes, Normans now fused in spite of the racial restrictions on intermarriages into one nation, so the ancient racial distinctions of Aryans, Kolarians, Dravidians and others even if they had ever been keen, can no longer be recognized. We have dealt with the point as exhaustively as necessary in the foregoing sections and pointed out that the अनुलोम and प्रतिलोम systems recognized in our lawbooks bear indisputable testimony to the fact that a fusion sufficient to keep the flow of common blood through our body politic vigorous and fresh was even then an accomplished fact. Natur again broke the barriers where custom refused to pull them down in time. भीमसेन was neither the first nor the last of Aryans to make love with a हिडिंबा, nor the Brahmin lady, the mother of व्याधकर्मा, to whom we have referred already was the only Aryan girl that took a fancy to a व्याध youth. Out of a dozen Bhils or Kolis or even Santals, a youth or a girl may at times be picked up and dropped in a city school without any fear of being recognized as such either by a physical or by a moral test. The race that is born of the fusion, which on the whole is a healthy one, because gradual, of the Aryans, Kolarians, Dravidians and all those of our ancestors, whose blood we as a race inherent, is rightly called neither an Aryan, nor Kolarian, nor Draviadian—but the Hindu race : that is, that people who live as children of a common motherland, adoring a common holyland--the land that lies between the सिंधुs. Therefore the संतालs, कोळीs, भिल्लs, पंचमs, नामशूद्रs and all other such tribes and classes are Hindus. This सिंधुस्थान

is as emphatically, if not more emphatically, the land of their forefathers as of those of the so called Aryans; they inherit the Hindu blood and the Hindu culture; and even those of them who have not as yet come fully under the influence of any orthodox Hindu sect, do still worship deities and saints and follow a religion, which however primitive, are still purely attached to this land, which therefore to them is not only a fatherland but a Holyland.

There would have been no serions objection raised against the cultural aspect of हिंदुत्व too, but for the unfortunate misunderstanding that owes its origin to the confusing similarity between the two terms हिंदुत्व and Hindusim. We have tried already to draw a clear line of demarcation between the two conceptions and protested against the wrong use of the word Hinduism to denote the सनातन धर्म alone. हिंदुत्व is not identical with हिंदुधर्म; nor is हिंदुधर्म identical with Hinduism. This twofold mistake that identifies हिंदुत्व with हिंदुधर्म and both with सनातनी sects is justly resented by our non-सनातनी sects or religious systems and goads a small section of people amongst them—not to explode this mistaken notion, but unfortunately to commit another grave and suicidal mistake in the opposite direction and disown their हिंदुत्व itself. We hope that our definition will leave no ground for any such bitterness of feelings on either side and based on truth as it is wonld be acknowledged by all the fair-minded people through out our Hindu Society. But as in the general treatment of this question we could not take any notice of any special case we shall do so now. Let us first

take the case of our शीख brotherhood. No one could be so silly as to contest the statement that सिंधुस्थान, "आसिंधु सिंधुपर्यंता भारत-भूमिका", is their Fatherland—the land that ever since the first extant records of the Vedic Period has been the land where their forefathers lived and loved and worshipped and prayed. Secondly, they most undoubtedly inherit the Hindu blood in their veins as much as any one in Madras or Bengal does. Nay more: While we Hindus in Maharashtra or Bengal inherit the blood of the Aryans as well as of those other ancient people who inhabited this land, the Sikhs are the almost direct descendants of those ancient सिंधुs and can claim to have drunk their being at the very fountain of this Ganges of our Hindu Life before she had descended down to the planes. Thirdly, they have contributed and therefore are the rightful copartners in our Hindu culture. For सरस्वती was a river in the Punjab before she became the Deified Image of Learning and Art. To this day, do millions of Hindus through out Hindusthan join in the enchanted chorus with which the सिंधुs, your forefathers, Oh Sikhs, paid the tribute of a grateful people to, and extolled the glories of, the River on whose banks the first seeds of our Culture and civilization were sown, and catching their Rigvedic accents sing "अंवितमे नदीतमे । देवितमे सरस्वति ।" The Vedas are theirs as they are ours, if not as a revelation, yet as a revered work that sings of the first giant struggles of Man to tap the sources of Nature, the first giant struggle of Light against the forces of Darkness and Ignorance, that had stolen and kept imprisoned the spirited waters and refused to allow the rays of Illumination to touch

man and rouse the Soul in him. The story of the Sikhs, like any one of us must begin with the Vedas, pass on through the palaces of Ayodhya, witness the battlefield of Lanka, help लहु to lay the foundation of Lahore and watch prince सिद्धार्थ leave the confines of कपिलवस्तु and enter the caves to find some way out to lighten the sorrows of Man. The Sikhs along with us bewail the fall of पृथ्वीराज, share the fate of a conquered people, and suffer together as Hindus. Millions of Sikhs—उदासीs, निर्मलs, the गहनगंभीरs and the सिंधी शिखs adore the संस्कृत language not only as the language of their ancestors but as the sacred language of their Land. While the rest cannot but own it as the tongue of their forefathers and as the Mother of Gurumukhi and Punjabi, which yet in its infancy is still sucking the milk of Life at its breast. Lastly the land आसिंधु सिंधु-पर्यंता is not only the पितृभू but also the पुण्यभू to the Sikhs. Guru Nanak and Guru Govind, Shri Banda and Ramsing were born and bred in Hindusthan ; the lakes of Hindusthan are the lakes of nector and of freedom—अमृतसर and मुक्तसर; the land of Hindusthan is the land of prophets and prayers—गुरुद्वार and गुरु घर. Really if any community in India is Hindu beyond cavil or criticism it is our Sikh brotherhood in the Punjab, being almost the autochthonous dwellers of the सप्तसिंधु land and the direct descendants of the सिंधु or हिंदु people. The Sikh of to-day is the Hindu of yesterday and the Hindu of to-day may be the Sikh of to-morrow. The change of a dress, or a custom, or a detail of daily life cannot change the blood or the seed nor can efface and blot out history itself.

To the millions of our Sikh brethren their हिंदुत्व is self-evi-

dent. The सहजधारी, उदासी, निर्मल, गहनगंभीर and the सिंधी Sikhs are proud of being Hindus by race and by nationality. As their Gurus themselves had been the children of Hindus they would fail to understand if not resent any such attempt to class them as Non-Hindus. The गुरुग्रंथ is read by the सनातनिs as well as by the Sikhs as a sacred work: both of them have fairs and festivals in common. The Sikhs of the तत्खाल्सा sect also, so far as the bulk of their population is concerned, are equally attached to their racial appellation and live amongst Hindus as Hindus. It cannot be but shocking to them to be told that they had suddenly ceased to be Hindus. Our racial Unity is so unchallenged and complete that inter-marriages are quite common amongst the Sikhs and सनातनीs.

The fact is that the protest that is at times raised by some leaders of our Sikh brother-hood against their being classed as Hindus would never have been heard if the term Hinduism was not allowed to get identical with Sanatanism. This confusion of ideas and the vagueness of expression resulting therefrom, are at the root of this fatal tendency that mars at times the cordial relations existing between our sister Hindu Communities. We have tried to make it clear that हिंदुत्व is not to be determined by any theological tests. Yet we must repeat it once more that the Sikhs are free to reject any or all things they dislike as superstitions in सनातनधर्म, even the binding authority of the Vedas as a revelation. They thereby may cease to be सनातनिs, but cannot cease to be Hindus. Sikhs are Hindus in the sense of our definition of हिंदुत्व and not in any religious sense whatever.

Religiously they are Sikhs, as Jains are Jains, Lingayats are Lingayats, Vaishnavas are Vaishnavas:—but all of us racially and nationally and culturally are a polity and a people, one and indivisible, most filty and from times immemorial called Hindus. No other word can express our racial oneness—not even भारतीय can do that for reasons dealt with in the foregoing sections. भारतीय indicates an Indian and expresses a larger generalization but cannot express racial unity of us Hindus. We are Sikhs, and Hindus and Bharatiyas. We are all three put together and none exclusively.

Another reason besides this fear of being indetified with the followers of सनातनपंथ which added to the zeal of some of our Sikh brothers and made them insist on getting classed separately as non-Hindus, was political one. This is not the place of entering into merits or demerits of a special representation. The Sikhs were naturally anxious to guard the special interests of their community and if the Mohomedans could enjoy the privilege of a special and communal representation, we do not understand why any other important minority in India should not claim similar concessions. But we feel that the claim should not have been backed up by our Sikh brothers by an untenable and suicidal plea of being non-Hindus. Sikhs, to guard their own interests, could have pressed for and succeeded in securing special and communal representation ont he ground of being an important minority as our non-Brahmins and other communities have done without renouncing their birth-right of हिंदुत्व. Our Sikh brotherhood is certainly not a less important community than the Moha-

madans—in fact to us Hindus they are more important than any non-Hindu Community in India. The harm that a special and communal representation does is never so great as the harm done by the attitude of racial aloofness. Let the Sikhs, the Jains, the Lingayats, the non-Brahmins and even, for the matter of that, Brahmins press and fight for the right of special and communal representation, if they honestly look upon it as indispensable for their communal growth. For their growth is the growth of the whole Hindu Society. Even in ancient times our four main castes enjoyed a kind of special representation on communal basis in our councils of State as well as in local bodies. They could do that without refusing to get fused into the larger whole and incorporated into the wider generalization of हिंदुत्व. Let the Sikhs be classed as Sikhs religiously; but us Hindus racially, nationally and culturally.

The brave people who placed their heads by hundreds under the executioner's are rather than disown their Guru—धर्महेत शाका जिन किया। शिर दिया पर शिरह न दिया!—will they disown their seed, forswear their fathers and sell their birthright for a mess of pottage! God forbid! Let our minorities remember that if Union lies in strength then in हिंदुत्व lies the firmest and yet the dearest bond that can effect a real, lasting and powerful union of our people. You may fancy that it pays you to remain aloof for the passing hour, but it will do incalculable harm to this our ancient race and civilization as a whole—and especially to yourselves. Your interests are indissolubly bound with the interests of

your other Hindu brethren. Whenever in the future as in the past, a foreigner raises a sword against the Hindu civiliza tion, it is sure to strike you as deadly as any other Hindu community. Whenever in future as in the past, the Hindus as a people come to their own and under a Shivaji or a Ranjit a Ramchandra or a Dharma, an Ashoka or an Amoghwarsha feeling the quickening touch of life and activity mount the, pinnacles of glory and greatness—that day would shed its lustre on you as well as on any other member of our Hindu Commonwealth. So, brothers, be not dismayed by the im mediate gains, paltry or otherwise, nor be duped by mis readings and misinterpretations of history. I was once told by one, who posing as a ग्रंथी was nevertheless convicted for committing a dacoity in the house of a Brahmin to whom he owed money and whom he consequently murdered—that the Sikhs were not Hindus and that they could incur no guilt by killing a Brahmin as the sons of Govindsing were be-trayed by a Brahmin cook! Fortunately there was another Sikh gentleman and a real ग्रंथी and was recognized as such by all learned Sikhs who immediately contradicted and cornered him by several examples of मतिदास and others, who had sheltered the Guru and proved true to the Sikhs even unto martyrdom. Was not Shivaji betrayed by his kith and kin and his grandson again by a पिसाळ who too was a Hindu? But did Shivaji or his nation disown their race and cease to be Hindus? Many of the Sikhs have acted treacherously first at the time of desertion of the heoic Banda, then again at the time of the last war of the Khalsa forces.

with the English. Guru Govindsing himself was deserted by a number of Sikhs and in the very thick of fight and it was this act of treacherous cowardice of these Sikhs which by forcing our lion-hearted Guru to try a desparate sortie, gave occasion to that cursed Brahmin wretch to betray his two sons. If therefore for the crime of the latter we cease to be Hindus, then for the crime of the former we ought to cease to be Sikhs too!

The minority of the Hindus as well as the major communities of them did not fall from the skies as separate creations. They are an organic growth that has its roots embedded deep in a common land and in a common culture. You cannot pick up a lamb and by tying a कच्छ and कृपाण on it, make a lion of it! If the Guru succeeded in forming a band of martyrs and warriors he could do so because the race that produced him as well as that band, was capable of being moulded thus. The lion's seed alone can breed lions. The flower cannot say "I bloom and smile and smell: surely I came out of the stalk alone:—I have nothing to do with the roots!" No more can we deny our seed or our blood. As soon as you point a Sikh who was true to his Guru you have automatically pointed out a Hindu who was true to the Guru, for before being a Sikh he was, and yet continues to be, a Hindu. So long as our Sikh brethren are true to Sikhism they must of necessity continue to be Hindus; for so long must this land, this भारतभूमिका, आसिंधु सिंधुपर्यंता, remain their पितृभू and their पुण्यभू. It is by ceasing to be Sikhs alone that they may, perhaps, cease to be Hindus.

We have dealt at some length with this special case of our Sikh brotherhood as all those arguments and remarks would automatically test all similar cases of our other अवैदिक sects and religions in the light of our definition. The देव-समाजीs for example are agnostics: but हिंदुत्व has little to do with agnoticism, or for the matter of that, atheism. The देवसमाजीs look on this land as the land of their forefathers, their पितृभू as well as their पुण्यभू, and are therefore Hindus. Of course, it is superfluous, after all this, to refer to our आर्यसमाज:— all the essetials of हिंदुत्व hold good in their case so eminently that they are Hindus of Hindus. We, in fact, are unable to hit upon any case that can lay our definition open to the charge of exclusiveness.

In one case alone it seems to offer some real difficulty. Is, for example, Sister Nivedita a Hindu? If ever an exception proves the rule it does so here. Our patriotic and noble minded sister had adopted our land आसिंधु सिंधुपर्यंता as her पितृभू. She truly loved it as such, and had our nation been free, we would have been the first to bestow the right of citizenship on such loving souls. So the first essential may, to some extent, be said to hold good in her case. The second essential of common blood, of Hindu patronage must, never-the-less and necessarily, be absent in such cases as these. The sacrament of marriage with a Hindu which really fuses, and is universally admitted to do so, two beings into one may be said to remove this disqualification. But although this second essential failed, either way, to hold good in her case, the third important qualification of हिंदुत्व did entitle her to be

recognised as a Hindu. For, she had adopted our culture and came to adore our land as her पुण्यभू. She *felt*, she was a Hindu and that is, apart from all technicalities, the real and the most important test. But we must not forget that we have to determine the essentials of हिंदुत्व in the sense in which the word is actually used by an overwhelming majority of our people. And therefore we must say that any convert of non-Hindu parentage to Hindutva can be a Hindu, if *bona fide*, he or she adopts our land as his or her country and marries a Hindu, thus coming to love our land as a real पितृभू; and adopts our culture and thus adores our land as the पुण्यभू. The children of such a union as that would, other things being equal, be most emphatically Hindus. We are not authorised to go further.

But, by coming to believe into the tenets of any sects of the Hindus, a foreign convert may be recognised as a सनातनी, or a शीख, or a जैन; and as these religions being founded by or revealed to Hindus, go by the name of हिंदु-धर्म the convert too, may be religiously called a Hindu. But it must be understood that a religious or cultural convert possesses only one of the three essentials of हिंदुत्व and it is owing to this disqualification that people generally do not recognise as a Hindu any one and every one who contributes to the religious beliefs of our race. So deep our feeling of gratitude is towards a Sister Nivedita or an Annie Besant for the services they rendered to the cause of our Motherland and our culture, so soft hearted and sensitive to the touch of Love as a race we Hindus are, that Sister Nivedita or a person like her who so

completely identifies his or her being with the Being of our people, is almost unconsciously received in the Hindu fold. But it should be done as an exception to the rule. The rule itself must neither be too rigid nor too elastic. The several tests to which we have subjected our definition of हिंदुत्व have, we believe, proved it that it satisfies both these requirements and involves neither अव्याप्ति nor अतिव्याप्ति.

VIII.

So far we have not allowed any considerations of utility to prejudice our inquiry. But having come to its end it will not be out of place to see how far the attributes, which we found to be the essentials of हिंदुत्व, contribute towards strength, cohesion, and progress, of our people. Do these essentials constitute a foundation so broad, so deep, so strong that basing upon it the Hindu people can build a Future which can face and repel the attacks of all the adverse winds that blow; or does the Hindu Race stand on Feet of clay?

Some of the ancient nations raised huge walls so as to convert a whole country into a fortified castle. To-day their walls are trodden to dust or are but scarcely discernible by a few scattered mounds here and there; while the People they were meant to protect are not discernible at all! Our ancient neighbours, the Chinese, laboured from generation to generation and raised a rampart, embracing thel imits of an empire—so wide, so high, so strong—a wonder of human world. That too, as all human wonders must, sank under its own weight. But behold the ramparts of Nature! Hav they not, these Himalayas, been standing there as one who desires are satiafied—so they seemed to the Vedic bard— they seem to us to-day. These are *our* ramparts that h converted this vast continent into a cosy castle.

You take up buckets and fill your trenches with water and call it moat. Behold, Varuna himself, with his one hand pushing continents aside, fills the gap by pouring seas on seas with the other! This Indian ocean with its bays and gulfs, is *our* moat.

These are our frontier lines bringing within our reach the advantages of an in-land as well as an insular country.

She is the richly endowed daughter of God—This our Motherland. Her rivers are deep and perennial. Her land is yielding to the plough and her fields loaded with golden harvests. Her necessaries of life are few and a genial nature yields them all almost for the asking. Rich in her fauna, rich in her flora, she knows she owes it all to the immediate source of light and heat—The Sun. She covets not the icy lands : blessed be they and their frozen latitudes. If heat is at times 'enervating' here, cold is at times beumbing there. If cold induces manual labour, heat removes much of its very necessity. She takes more delight in quenched thirst than in the parched throat. Those who have not, let them delight in exerting to have. But those who have—may be allowed to derive pleasure from the very fact of having. Father Thames is free to work at feverish speed, wrapped in his icy sheets. She loves to visit her ghats and watch her boats gliding down the Ganges, on her moonlit waters. With the plough, the peacocks, the lotus, the elephant and the Gita, she is willing to forego, if that must be, whatever advantage the colder latitudes enjoy. She knows she cannot have all her own way. Her

gardens are green and shady, her granaries well sto cked, her waters crystal, her flowers scented, her fruits juicy and her herbs healing. Her brush is dipped in the colours of Dawn and her flute resonant with the music of Gokul. Verily Hind is the richly endowed daughter of God.

Neither the English nor the French—with the exception of the Chinese and perhaps the Americans, no people are gifted with a land that can equal in natural strength and richness the land of सिंधुस्थान. A country, a common home is the first important essential of stable and strong nationality ; and as of all countries in the world our country can hardly be surpassed by any in its capacity to afford a soil so specially fitted for the growth of a great nation, we Hindus whose very first article of faith is the love we bear to the common Fatherland, have in that love the strongest talismanic tie that can bind close and keep a nation firm and enthuse and enable it to accomplish things greater than ever.

The second essential of हिंदुत्व puts the estimate of our latent powers of national cohesion and greatness yet higher. No country in the world with the exception of China again, is peopled by a race so homogeneous, yet so ancient and yet so strong both numerically and vitally. The Americans too, whom we found equally fortunate with us so far as the gift of an excellent geographical basis of nationality is concerned, are decidedly left behind. Mohamedans are no race nor are the Christians. They are a religious unit, yet neither a racial nor a national one. But we Hindus, if possible, are all the three put together and live under our ancient and

common roof. The numerical strength of our race is an asset that cannot be too higly prized.

And culture? The English and the Americans feel they are kith and kin because they posses a Shakespeare in common. But not only a Kalidas or a Bhas, but Oh Hindus! ye possess a Ramayan and a Mahabharat in common—and the Vedas! One of the national songs the American children are taught to sing attempts to rouse their sense of eternal self-importance by pointing out to the hundred years twice told that stand behind their history. The Hindu counts his years not by centuries but by cycles--the युग and the कल्प--and amazed asks 'रघुपतेः क्व गतोत्तरकोशला। यदुपतेः क्व गता मथुरापुरी !!' He does not attempt to rouse the sense of self importance so much as the sense of proportion, which is Truth. And that has perhaps made him last longer than Ramses and Nebuchadnezzar. If a people that had no past has no future, then a people who had preduced an unending galaxy of heroes and heroworshippers and who are conscious of having faught with and vanquished the forces whose might struck Greece and Rome, the Pharaohs and the Incas, dead, have in their history a guarantee of their future greatness more assuring than any other people on earth yet possess.

But besides culture the tie of common holy-land has at times proved stronger than the chains of a Motherland. Look at the Mohamadans. Mecca to them is a sterner reality than Delhi or Agra. Some of them do not make any secret of being bound to sacrifice all Indian if that be to the glory of Islam or could save the city of their Prophet. Look

at the Jews: neither centuries of prosperity nor sense of gratitude for the shelter they found can make them more attached or even equally attached to the several countries they inhabit. Their love is, and must necessarily be, divided between the land of their birth and the land of their Prophets. If the Zionsts' dreams are ever realized—if Palestine becomes a Jewis State and it will galdden us almost as much as our Jewish friends----they, like the Mahomedans would naturally set the interests of their Holy-land above those of their Motherlands in America & Europe and in case of war between their adopted country and the Jewish state, would naturally sympathise with the latter, if indeed they do not bodily go over to it. History is too full of examples of such desertions to cite particulars. The crusades again, attest to the wonderful influence that a common holy land exercises over peoples widely separated in race, nationality and language, to bind and hold them together.

The ideal conditions therefore under which a nation can attain perfect solidarity and cohesion would, other things being equal, be found in the case of those people who inhabit the land they adore, the land of whose forefathers is also the land of their Gods anp Angels, of Seers and Prophets; the scenes of whose history are also the scenes of their mythology.

The Hindus are about the only people who are blessed with these ideal conditions that are at the same time incentive to national solidarity, cohesion and greatness. Not even the Chinese are blessed thus. Only Arabia and Palestine—if ever the Jews can succeed in founding their state there—can

be said to possess this iunque advantage. But Arabia is incomparably poorer in the natural, cultural, historical, and numerical essentials of a great people ; and even if the dreams of the Zionists are ever realized into a Palestine State still they too must be equally lacking in these.

England, France, Germany, Italy, Turkey proper, Persia, Japan, Afganistan, Egypt of to-day (for the old descendands of 'Punto' and their Egypt is dead long since)—and other African states, Mexico, Peru, Chilly (not to mention states and nations lesser than all these)—though racially more or less homogeneous, are yet less advantageously situated than we are, in geographical, cultural, historical and numerical essentials, besides lacking the unique gift of a sanctified Motherland. Of the remaining nations Russia in Europe, and United States in America, though geographically equally well-gifted with us, are yet poorer in almost every other requisite of nationality. China alone of the present comity of nations is almost as richly gifted with the geographical, racial, cultural and numerical essentials as the Hindus are. Only in the prosession of a common, a sacred and a perfect langauge, thə Sanskrit, and a sanctified Motherland are we, so far as the essentials that contribute to national solidarity are concerned, more fortunate.

Thus the actual essentials of हिंदुत्व are, as this running sketch reveals, also the ideal essentials of Nationality. If we would we can build on this foundation of हिंदुत्व a future greater than what any other people on earth can yet dream of :—greater even than our own Past. Provided we are able

to utilize our opportunities ! For let our people remember that Great Combinations are the order of the day. The leagues of Nations, the alliances of Powers, Panislamism, Panslavism, Panethiopism,—all little beings seeking to get themselves incorporated into greater wholes, so as to be better fitted for the struggle for existence and power. Those who are not naturally and historically blessed with numerical or gorgaphical or racial advantages are seeking to share them with others. Woe to those who have them already as their birthright and knew them not ; or worse, dispise them ! Thenations of the world are desparately trying to find a place in this or that combination for aggression ;--can any one of you, Oh Hindus ! whether जैन or संमाजी or सनातनी or शीख or anyother subsection, afford to cut yourselves off or fall out and destroy the ancient, the natural and the organic combinatoin that already exits ?—combination that is bound not by any scraps of paper nor by the ties of exigencies alone, but by the ties of blood and birth and culture ? Strengthen them if you can : pull down the barriers that have survived their utility, of castes and customs, of sects and sections : What of inter-dining ?—but intermarriages between provinces and provinces, castes and castes, be encouraged where they do not exist. But where they already exist as between the Sikhs and Sanatanies, Jains and Vaishnavas, Lingayats and Non-Lingayats—suicidal be the hand that ties to cut the nuptial tie. Let the minorities remember they would be cutting the very branch on which they stand. Strengthen every tie that binds you to the main organism, whether of blood or langauge or common festivals

and feasts or culture and the love you bear to the common Motherland. Let this ancient and noble stream of Hindu blood flow from vein to vein, from अटक to कटक, till at last the Hindu people get fused and welded into an indivisible whole, till our race gets consolidated and strong and sharp as steel.

Just cast a glance at the past, then at the Present: Pan-islamism in Asia, the Political Leagues in Europe, the Pan-ethiopic movement in Africa and America:—and then see, Oh Hindus, if your future is not entirely bound up with the future of India: and the future of India is bound up, in the last resort, with Hindu strength. We are trying our best, as we aught to do, to develop the consciousness of and a sense of attachment to the greater whole, whereby Hindus, Mohamedans, Parsis, Christians and Jews would feel as Indians first and every other thing afterwards. But whatever progress India may have made to that goal one thing remains almost axiomatically true--not only in India but every where in the wcrld—that a nation requires a foundation to stand upon and the essence of the life of a nation is the life of that portion of its citizens whose interests and history and aspirations are most closely bound up with the land and who thus provide the real foundation to the structure of their national state. Take the case of Turkey. The young Turks after the revolution, had to open their Parliament and military institutions to Armenians and Christians on a non-religious and secular basis. But when the war with Servia came the Christians and Armenians first wavered and then many a regiment consisting of them went bodily over to the

Servians, who politically and racially and religiously were more closely bound up with them. Take the case of America; when the German war broke out she suddenly had to face the danger of desertions of her German citizens; while the Negro citizens there sympathise more with their brethren in Africa than with their white countrymen. American State, in the last resort, must stand or fall with the fortunes of its Anglo-Saxon constituents. So with the Hindus. They being the people, whose past, present and future are most closely bound with the soil of Hindusthan as पितृभू, as a पुण्यभू, they constitute the foundation, the bedrock, the reserved forces of the Indian state. Therefore even from the point of Indian Nationality, must ye, Oh Hindus, consolidate and strengthen Hindu Nationality: not to give wanton offence to any of our non-Hindu compatriots, in fact to any one in the world, but in just and urgent self-defence of our race and land; to render it impossible for others to betray her or to subject her to unprovoked attackes by any of those 'Pan-isms' that are struggling forth from continent to continent. As long as other communities in India or in the world are not respectively planning India first or Mankind first, but all are busy in organising offensive and defensive alliances and combinations on entirely narrow racial or religious or national basis, so long, at least so long, Oh Hindus, strengthen if you can those subtle bonds that like nervethreads bind you in One Organic Social Being. Those of you who in a suicidal fit try to cut off the most vital of those ties and dare to disown the name Hindu will find to their cost that in doing so they have cut

themselves off from the very source of our racial Life and Strength.

The presence of only a few of these essentials of nationality which we have found to constitute हिंदुत्व enabled little nations like Spain or Portugal to get themselves lionised in the world. But when all of those ideal conditions obtain here what is there in the human world that the Hindus cannot accomplish?

Twenty-two crores of people, with India for their basis of operation, for their Fatherland and for their Holyland, with such a history behind them, bound together by ties of a common blood and common culture, can dictate their terms to the whole world. A day will come when mankind will have to face the force.

Equally certain it is that whenever the Hindus come to hold such a position whence they could dictate terms to the whole world—those terms cannot be very different from the terms which Gita dictates or the Buddha lays down. A Hindu is most intensely so, when he ceases to be a Hindu; and with a शंकर claims the whole earth for a Benares" वाराणसी मेदिनी !" or with a Tukaram exclaims "आमुचा स्वदेश ! भुवनत्रयामध्यें वास !—my country ? Oh brothers, the limits of the Universe :—there the frontiers of my country lie !"